

HISTORY
vs.
**The Whitman Saved
Oregon Story**

WILLIAM I. MARSHALL

Cornell University Library

THE GIFT OF

Professor E. H. Hull

A.30.616

20/IX/15

~~DATE DUE~~

OCT 29 1948 J

MAR 17 1952

~~AUG 25 1965 M E~~

Cornell University Library
F 880 M36

History vs. the Whitman saved Oregon sto



3 1924 028 885 395

olin



Cornell University
Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

HISTORY

vs.

THE WHITMAN SAVED OREGON STORY

Three Essays towards a true history of the Acquisition of the old Oregon Territory (being nearly one-twelfth of all our domain on this continent), which was the longest, the most remarkable — and when truthfully told—the most interesting struggle we have ever made for territory.

BY

WILLIAM I. MARSHALL

Principal of the Wm. E. Gladstone School, Chicago
Member American Historical Association

Cloth 50 cts., Paper 25 cts.

PRESS OF THE BLAKELY PRINTING CO., CHICAGO

1904

4

A-301616

Copyright, 1902, 1903, 1904
By WILLIAM I. MARSHALL
All Rights Reserved

INTRODUCTION.

CORRECTIONS

Page 3. I find that a newspaper sketch of Mr. Harvey W. Scott (on which I depended) was incorrect in stating that he was a native of the old Oregon Territory, whereas he was born in Illinois, in 1838, and with his parents migrated to the old Oregon Territory when a boy of 14; but as all his subsequent education in school and college was in that region with which his life has now been closely identified for more than half a century, he is, for all practical purposes as much of an "Oregonian," as if he had first beheld the light there.

Page 17. Fifteenth line from the bottom, e was omitted after W. It should read, "We felt that," etc.

Page 66. Third line, May 26 should be May 16.

Page 83. Since publishing this book I have learned that Dr. Silas Reed was within a few weeks of 78 years old when he wrote this letter to Prest. L. G. Tyler.

Page 91. Twenty-fifth line, "was" should be changed to "way," so that it will read, "and in every way as worthless historically."

It will be noticed that not one of these trifling "inaccuracies," (which are the only ones yet either discovered by me, or reported to me by the few hostile critics who have attacked the book), has the slightest bearing on any question relating to the Whitman Legend.

If any one discovers any inaccuracy—typographical or otherwise—in any of my writings, I shall be greatly obliged if notice of the same is promptly mailed to me.

WM. I. MARSHALL.

August 21, 1905.

On reading the manuscript of the "Strange Treatment," without solicitation he wrote and put at the head of his editorial page his opinion of it, in the editorial reprinted on page 7 infra.

Several of the topics in the "Strange Treatment" being also treated in the review of Rev. M. Eells' "Reply," it seemed best, when printing these two essays together, to somewhat amplify those topics in the "Strange Treatment" as it was

INTRODUCTION.

A great amount of unexpected work connected with school affairs making it necessary for me to defer the publication of my "History of the Acquisition of the Old Oregon Territory and the Long-Suppressed Evidence About Marcus Whitman" (which I had intended to publish before May 15, 1904) till the autumn of 1904, so that I may have the summer vacation to carefully re-examine all its numerous quotations and compare them with the originals, and to complete a very full index to it, I have decided to issue a limited edition of these three essays, more especially for the information of some writers whose study of the long struggle for nearly one-twelfth of all our domain on this continent has been so exceedingly superficial, that they are willing to accept such aggregations of blunders as Dr. Mowry's "Marcus Whitman," and Rev. Dr. Eells' "Reply to Professor Bourne," and Barrows' "Oregon," and Nixon's "How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon," and Craighead's "Story of Marcus Whitman," as trustworthy historical authorities.

The "Strange Treatment of Original Sources" was published September 3, 1902, in the Daily Oregonian, for many years the leading paper of Oregon, its publication having been arranged for, not by me, but by a prominent citizen of the old Oregon Territory, who desires to have its history correctly written.

Mr. Harvey W. Scott (editor-in-chief of the Oregonian, and first president of the Oregon Historical Society) is a native of the old Oregon Territory, and not only ranks as one of the most brilliant and successful of American newspaper editors, but is beyond all question *one* of the very best, and probably *the* best, informed man now living, about the *whole* history of the old Oregon Territory.

On reading the manuscript of the "Strange Treatment," without solicitation he wrote and put at the head of his editorial page his opinion of it, in the editorial reprinted on page 7 *infra*.

Several of the topics in the "Strange Treatment" being also treated in the review of Rev. M. Eells' "Reply," it seemed best, when printing these two essays together, to somewhat amplify those topics in the "Strange Treatment" as it was

published in the *Oregonian*, so as to be able to cut out a good deal of the matter in the review of M. Eells' "Reply" as it was originally written, and still have it complete by references to the appropriate pages in the "Strange Treatment."

The discussion of Professor Bourne's paper being a reprint from the electrotypes of the Transactions of the American Historical Association for 1900, necessarily retains the paging it had in that volume.

My forthcoming book will for the first time give the public a full and connected history of the whole of the struggle for the acquisition of Oregon, as it appears from a very careful study of the original sources, and will have full chapters on the following (and other) topics:

(a) The Governmental Action to Secure Oregon from 1803 to 1872, Being a Full Record of Diplomatic Negotiations with France, Spain, England and Russia; of Congressional Debates, of Congressional Committee Reports and of the Explorations and Reports Thereon of United States Naval and Military Officers and Special Agents.

(b) The Truth About the Discovery of Routes Practicable for and the Development of the First Transcontinental Wagon Road, 1806 to 1846.

(c) The Truth About the Relation of the Hudson's Bay Company to the American Exploration, Occupation and Settlement of the Oregon Territory, as Stated in the Contemporaneous Letters, and Journals, and Reports to the Government, and Books, and Magazine Articles, of Every American—fur trader, scientist, missionary, private explorer or government officer or leader of a party of emigrants—who left any such contemporaneous documents (as far as known) down to the Treaty of 1846. Much of this has never yet been published and much more is difficult of access.

(d) The Long-Suppressed Evidence About the Origin and Purpose of Whitman's Ride.

(e) All the letters Whitman ever wrote making claims that the establishment of his mission and his ride had been of benefit to the nation. Most of this has been heretofore suppressed.

(f) The Long-Suppressed Evidence as to the Rapid Decadence of the Whitman-Spalding-Eells-Walker Mission after 1839-40, and especially after 1843.

(g) The True Causes of the Whitman Massacre, with the Conclusive Proof—some hitherto suppressed and the rest difficult of access—of the total falsity of the accusation that the Hudson's Bay Company and the Catholics instigated or were in any way responsible for that perfectly natural outburst of Indian ferocity.

These chapters will contain all (and much more than all) the evidence which submitted by me in manuscript, as stated

on pages 48-51 *infra.*, has convinced every historian who has had the privilege of reading it that the whole Whitman Saved Oregon Story is a delusion, and the additional evidence in these chapters, especially that which has been heretofore suppressed, will prove quite as surprising as to the little interest in the question of a wagon road to Oregon or the political destiny of Oregon displayed by Whitman and all his associates from 1836 to 1843, and as to the true relation of the Hudson's Bay Company to the American exploration, occupation and settlement of Oregon, and as to the decadence of the American Board Mission, and as to the true causes of the Whitman Massacre, as the evidence heretofore submitted proved to be, as to the origin and purpose of Whitman's ride.

As to all the other books, and magazine and newspaper articles advocating the Whitman Saved Oregon Story, they, without exception, are as far from being trustworthy history as are Dr. Mowry's "Marcus Whitman" and Rev. Dr. M. Eells' "Reply," but to expose all their suppressions, and false assumptions, and misquotations, and misstatements would require a thousand pages.

Barrows' "Oregon" and Nixon's "How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon" have had the widest circulation of any of them, and neither book even alludes to the existence of any of the correspondence of Whitman and his associates with the American Board in 1840-41, which caused the Board to issue its destructive order of February, 1842 (which neither of them either quotes or alludes to), which order was the sole cause of Whitman's ride.

The simplest test of the value of any historical writing is to examine the honesty and accuracy of its quotations and its summaries of documents too long to quote, and any writer who does not quote accurately and summarize fairly and impartially is wholly unworthy of credence. I have compared every quotation in Barrows' "Oregon," and Nixon's "How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon," with the book, government document, magazine or newspaper in which it originally appeared, or is alleged to have appeared (for some of the "quotations" are pure fabrications, and never appeared as stated), and in neither book is there so much as one honest quotation on any important disputed point.

On some unimportant disputed, and some important undisputed points, there are fair quotations, but on all the important disputed points the quotations range in unfairness all the way from that device—as disreputable as it is ancient—of quoting accurately up to a certain point, and stopping when the very next succeeding paragraph of the context shows that the impression sought to be created by the part quoted is directly contrary to the facts; or quoting less than a hundred words

from an article covering nearly 8,000 words in an English review, and stating that it was defamatory of Oregon and printed to deceive Americans as to its value and so cause them to abandon the whole of it to England, when not only the evident, but the explicitly avowed purpose of the writer was to persuade England that it ought to yield to the American claim as far North as 49°, and make that the northern boundary of Oregon; or quoting only fourteen words from a long article not published in the *London Examiner* till July 24, 1847—more than four years after Whitman started back to Oregon—and deliberately antedating it to 1843, and so making it appear to have been published prior to Whitman's arrival in the States, and to have been designed to deceive us as to the value of Oregon, when, as a matter of fact, the very first sentence in the article (the whole of which is easily accessible, being quoted (but without its date) in the "Introduction to the Works of D. Webster," page CXLIX), plainly shows that it was written some time after the treaty of 1846, fixing the boundary of Oregon was made, and that its purpose was to congratulate the English Government for its wisdom in yielding to the American claim and fixing the boundary at 49°, and so avoiding the expenditure of life and treasure, which must have resulted from going to war over a region whose value would not have justified such expenditure; or prefacing the quotation of a single sentence from a long lecture by Captain William Sturgis, or of two brief sentences from a long speech by Senator Thomas H. Benton, by statements directly contrary to the sentiments of the whole of the lecture and the speech; to absolute forgeries (some of them attributed to Daniel Webster), so clumsily executed that their very language shows that they were never uttered by Webster, since, whatever were his failings, he always discussed great public questions in sensible and dignified English, and not in the style of a "sloppy" and sensational newspaper writer.

Presumably, neither Barrows nor Nixon manufactured these forgeries, but when they are so palpably fabricated, surely it is but little less reprehensible for them by quoting them to have endorsed them without any attempt at verifying them, than to have themselves originated them, precisely as there is little moral or legal distinction in the offense of manufacturing counterfeit money or in circulating it, when a mere glance shows to any fairly intelligent person that it is counterfeit, and when its acceptance by the unsuspecting is due to their faith in the knowledge and integrity of the circulator. Craighead's "Story of Marcus Whitman" (published by the "Presbyterian Board of Missions and Sunday School Work," and so put largely into S. S. libraries), is not only as worthless historically as these other books, but is even more ob-

jectionable, as its main purpose is to revive the shameful slander that the Catholics and the Hudson's Bay Co. instigated the Whitman Massacre.

From the *Daily Oregonian* (of Portland, Oregon), September 3, 1902:

"A SCATHING REVIEW."

"It is well to call attention to the article published to-day on 'The Whitman Myth,' by Principal William I. Marshall of Chicago. This article is a dissection of the pretensions of Dr. W. A. Mowry as an historian, as exhibited in his 'Marcus Whitman and the Early Days of Oregon.' It explodes completely the theory on which the Whitman myth is built—the theory, namely, that Oregon was about to be surrendered to Great Britain; that Whitman undertook his winter ride to prevent that result; that his ride 'saved Oregon'; that he collected and organized the migration of 1843, directed its march and showed it a wagon route over the plains and mountains. It shows how Dr. Mowry, following a preconceived idea and purpose of hero-making, has colored the history by his assumptions and misrepresented it by his suppressions. In this article there is close examination of the original sources of information for ascertainment of the origin and purpose of Whitman's ride; there is a review of the condition of the Oregon question at Washington, with positive proof that the assumption that the Tyler administration was indifferent to Oregon was unfounded, and consequently that Whitman could have exerted no influence to change the policy of the National Government towards Oregon; and, finally, there is demonstration that Whitman's relation towards the great migration of 1843 was slight and practically unimportant. Great service is done to the truth of history by this review. It is devotion to truth, not hostility to the memory of Whitman, that prompts the effort to clear this subject of its modern accretions of myth and fable.

"Whitman was but one of our pioneers. He was energetic and adventurous, at times far beyond wisdom or prudence; and to his blindness to real danger, which a wiser man would have avoided, the destruction of himself and of his family was due. He was apotheosized through his fate. Hero worship, stimulated by religious or by ecclesiastical devotion, has created his legend or myth, which in earlier and less critical times would doubtless have passed unchallenged. But in our age written and printed records are preserved, and the mythopeic faculty of the human mind receives checks and corrections unknown in the composition of the Homeric poems or portions of the Biblical narratives. But the tendency to hero worship and

love of the marvelous will never be wholly eliminated from the mind of man. Before the invention of writing and the use of printing people forgot their actual history—so uninteresting was it—and remembered only the fables they had built upon it.

“It is not the purpose of the *Oregonian* to repeat the statements presented in this review, but only to refer the reader to them and to bespeak for them careful examination. This review by no means exhausts the subject. There are other proofs, but Mr. Marshall, in this article, was dealing only with the methods of Dr. Mowry, which he has subjected to a searching and very complete exposure. Incidentally, a great deal of matter has been presented by this reviewer, in a new form.”

STRANGE TREATMENT OF ORIGINAL SOURCES.

A Review of "Marcus Whitman and the Early Days of Oregon," by Dr. W. A. Mowry. Silver, Burdett & Co., 1901.

(Copyright, 1902, by Principal William I. Marshall, Chicago.)

All rights reserved.

It was owing to Dr. Mowry's strong endorsement of the first published (or Spalding-Gray) version of the Whitman Saved Oregon Story to me, in 1877, that I was imposed upon by it from 1877 to 1882, and I have corresponded extensively with him upon it, especially since I discovered, and (in lectures in the great Peabody Institute course in Baltimore in November, 1884) demonstrated its total falsity; and he, as late as December 9, 1898, wrote me a letter imploring me not to publish the really vital evidence upon it, as follows:

"I have copied hundreds of typewritten pages from those letters" (i. e., of Whitman and his associates to the American Board) "during the last thirteen years.

"One thing, however, I have not felt at liberty to copy, and do not think the Board should ever have permitted you or any one else to copy.

"I refer to the confidential letters written by the missionaries to the Secretary of the Board, relating to their private and personal affairs, and particularly complaints one of another.

"I do not think you ought to publish any extracts from the letters of that character."

" In my own case, I always showed to the Secretary the matter which I had copied, and I believe that this has been the general practice. I certainly hope you will not make public such private affairs, even though the courtesy was extended to you to copy private letters."

I therefore awaited his "Marcus Whitman" with some curiosity to see whether he had written it on the lines of sup-

pression and evasion and special pleading indicated by his above quoted letter, or in accord with the universally accepted canons of honest historical investigation and writing, by which all real historians feel bound to work.

There are no letters in the correspondence of Whitman and his associates with the American Board, which, since the endorsement of the Whitman Saved Oregon Story, by the *Missionary Herald*, the official organ of that Board, in December, 1866, can with any propriety be considered as private or confidential, the public having an undoubted right to know the contents of all that correspondence in order that it may correctly judge of the validity of the claims made about Marcus Whitman, and of the credence it should give to the "statements" of Messrs. Spalding, Gray and C. Eells (from twenty-three to forty years after the event), on which alone the Whitman Saved Oregon Story rests.

No attempt was made by the Secretary of the American Board to limit the freedom and thoroughness of my investigations.

In his Preface, after informing us that he has been more than twenty years investigating the Whitman Saved Oregon subject, and that he has read "Everything I could lay my hands upon," Dr. Mowry says: "This book is a history. It is not an embellished story like Irving's *Astoria* or Parkman's *Oregon Trail*. It was written with the single purpose of stating in a clear and concise manner the important facts with which it has to deal. From first to last it has to do with facts."

On page 114 he says: "It should be the aim of the impartial historian to examine all sides of a disputed question, to sift all statements, to examine all theories, to go, as far as possible, to the original sources for his facts, and, free from bias or prejudice to state only that which appears to be thoroughly corroborated as truth."

Let us compare his performance with this correct statement of his duty.

He says (p. 1): "At one time our government ignored the country" (i. e., Oregon) "as worthless, and was not unwilling to sell it for a mess of pottage." (P. 2): "Finally the savages were permitted to butcher in cold blood the man who, by bravery and patriotism utterly unprecedented, wrested that entire country from the grasp of the Hudson's Bay Company, and made it possible for the United States to hold it." (pp. 170-71, writing of the spring of 1843, and of Webster's and Tyler's ideas of Oregon): "It was plainly apparent that Lord Ashburton, Sir George Simpson and others, with British proclivities, had thoroughly indoctrinated our statesmen with the idea that the Rocky Mountains were impassable to wagons, that Oregon could not be peopled from the States, and there-

fore its value to this country was small," and that "Webster thought Oregon was useless to our country on account of the impassable character of the mountains," and that "Tyler entertained precisely the same views" (as Webster) "as to the uselessness of Oregon to the United States." (pp. 191-2, speaking of those desiring to migrate to Oregon in 1843): "It is evident from a variety of sources of information that the great drawback to these would-be emigrants was that they could not carry their wagons and families through the mountains. The great Rocky Mountain range and the Blue Mountains were supposed to be impassable for wagons."

ONLY THREE IMPORTANT QUESTIONS CONCERNING WHITMAN.

As to Dr. Whitman there are but three really important questions, to wit:

(A) What was the origin and the purpose of Whitman's ride from Oregon to the States, begun October 3, 1842?

(B) What was the condition of the Oregon question at Washington (i. e., the attitude towards it of Tyler's Administration), in the winter of 1842-43 and the spring of 1843, and what influence, if any, did Whitman exert to change the policy of the National Government towards Oregon.

(C) What was Whitman's real relation to the great over-land migration of 1843?

Let us examine Dr. Mowry's treatment of the original sources concerning each of these three points.

ORIGINAL SOURCES AS TO "A."

As to (A) the *only important* original sources and the only ones that it is *certain* Dr. Mowry has examined are:

First. The correspondence of the Oregon Mission in the archives of the A. B. C. F. M. in Boston, prior to Whitman's return to Oregon in September, 1843, before which none of his associates knew that anything had occurred to make them wish their records different from what they had been written.

These letters, many of them very long (one covering 74 and another 52 pages of very large paper), number more than 200 and must aggregate considerably more than 400,000 words, and in them all is not one sentence expressing the least interest in or concern about the political destinies of any part of the Oregon Territory, or furnishing the least support in any other way to any form of the saving Oregon theory of Whitman's ride, and the same is true of all the correspondence of all these missionaries with their friends (so far as it has yet been published), during the whole time the Oregon question was unsettled, except that after Whitman had visited the States and found the whole country aflame about the Oregon

question he did, in some of his letters *after* his return, express some interest in the subject, and made some very extravagant and unfounded claims of having been largely instrumental in settling the question by having led out the 1843 migration.

The nearest to an expression of any interest in the political destiny of Oregon prior to Whitman's Ride is the following passage in an undated and hitherto unpublished letter of W. H. Gray (No. 136, Vol. 138, American Board archives), plainly written *after* October, 1839, and probably in November or December, 1839: "Dr. McLoughlin said to me that it was his wish that our people should occupy that place, and gave as a reason that then our people would be all together, and have nobody to meddle with us, and in case the boundary line was to be the Columbia River and the Fort" (i. e., Walla Walla) "was to be removed, he should like to have us there, both on account of the influence we might exert on the Indians and the men of the Fort. He did not wish to answer all my questions about the country, because it would imply a claim to the country, which they had none, except what their forts now occupied; he would say that he thought we had just as good a right to occupy any place as they had."

Any proper treatment of Whitman's career requires an honest summary (to the extent of 20 to 25 pages like this), of some 75,000 to 90,000 words of this correspondence, and in addition an accurate quotation of some 8,000 to 10,000 words more of it.

Of all this correspondence Dr. Mowry quotes only 510 words, and they—even as he quotes them—furnish no support to his theories about the political purpose of Whitman's ride.

All but 86 of these 510 words Professor Bourne had previously quoted in the "Legend of Marcus Whitman" as being the strongest possible evidence against the saving Oregon theory of Whitman's ride, and they have been considered as being conclusive against the theory of any saving Oregon purpose of that ride and as proving it to have been undertaken solely on the business of his mission, by such historians as Professor John Fiske, Dr. Edward Eggleston, Professor John B. McMaster, Professor Allen C. Thomas, Professor Harry P. Judson, Professor Edward C. McLaughlin, Horace E. Scudder, Principal Wilbur F. Gordy, Professor Edward Channing, Professor F. Newton Thorpe, etc., etc. (Cf. *Am. Hist. Review*, January, 1901 (pp. 276-300) and *Tr. Am. Hist. Assn.*; 1900, pp. 288-300).

But, whereas, Professor Bourne quoted accurately, Dr. Mowry quotes far otherwise.

The only document Whitman took with him to the American Board from the three men who remained associated with him in the Mission was the following:

"Resolved, That if arrangements can be made to continue the operations of this station, that Dr. Marcus Whitman be at liberty and advised to visit the United States as soon as practicable, to confer with the Committee of the A. B. C. F. M. in regard to the interests of this Mission.

(Signed)

"E. WALKER, Moderator.

"CUSHING EELLS, Scribe.

"Wailatpu, Sept. 28, 1842."

"H. H. SPALDING,"

This Dr. Mowry prints (on pp. 174-5), but omits the last eight words, "in regard to the interests of this mission," being the adverbial phrase which distinctly limited to the business of the mission the purpose for which all of his associates sanctioned his journey.

That this was an intentional omission is evident from the fact that in an article glorifying Whitman, in the *Boston Congregationalist*, November 18, 1897, Dr. Mowry omitted from his quotation of this document all after the word "practicable," putting a period there, where the document had a comma; and when he was criticised by me for making so deceptive a quotation, he defended it as justifiable, saying, "One sentence was all I needed, and I used that one," whereas there *is* but one complex sentence in the whole document, and the criticism was because he had *not* "used that one," but had omitted the two adverbial phrases which stated precisely why Whitman was authorized to make his ride.

Further, Dr. Mowry (p. 129) prefaces the 420 words he has quoted from *Rev. E. Walker's* letter of October 3, 1842, with the statement that "Father Eells . . . wrote a letter from which the following is quoted," and prints at the end of the extract,

"(Signed)

"CUSHING EELLS." "

Yet Dr. Mowry well knows (having mentioned this identical letter as one of Walker's in 1899, in a letter to the writer of this criticism), that this letter, which he thus ascribes to Cushing Eells, is indexed in the archives of the American Board as a letter from Rev. Elkanah Walker, and that of the 16 pages of this letter, 15, including every one of the 420 words he has quoted from it, are in the handwriting of Elkanah Walker, and that it is signed Elkanah Walker, and *not* Cushing Eells, and that every word in it which is in C. Eells' handwriting is the following endorsement of its correctness, on its fourteenth page, which, by mistake, Walker had left blank.

"Through mistake this page was omitted. I am happy to say the subjects of this letter have been frequently discussed of late by Mr. Walker and myself. I do not now recollect that there has been any important difference in the conclusions

arrived at, and I do most cheerfully add that considering the short time allowed for writing the letter I think it well done and consider the statements very just.

"The general plan of the letter was mutually agreed upon, and after hearing the whole of it read once and parts of it more than once, I have observed nothing of importance to which I cannot give a full assent."

(Signed)

"CUSHING EELLS."

To this endorsement by C. Eells, Dr. Mowry never alludes, though knowing all about it as his correspondence with me shows.

Rev. E. Walker's diary (in MS., in possession of the Oregon Historical Society) reads "Monday, Oct. 3, 1842. Commenced my letter to Mr. Greene. Succeeded better than I expected. Tuesday, 4. Continued to write and make slow progress. Wednesday, 5. Busy at writing, but feel as though I could not make out a good one . . . Thursday, 6. Still at my letter . . . Saturday, 8. Finished copying my letter to Mr. Greene and read it to Mr. Eells, who approved it."

So "the short time allowed for writing the letter" was six days.

Not another word besides these 510 is there in Dr. Mowry's book, written by Rev. C. Eells, Rev. H. H. Spalding, Rev. E. Walker, or Mr. W. H. Gray, to the Secretary of the American Board while the mission continued, nor subsequently down to May 28, 1866 (when Rev. C. Eells first endorsed the Whitman Saved Oregon story, in a letter which the *Missionary Herald* published in December, 1866), except that in his Appendix, Dr. Mowry prints two letters from Rev. C. Eells, and two from Rev. H. H. Spalding, written in December, 1847, and January, 1848, and relating to nothing but the dreadful massacre of November 29-December 8, 1847, in which Dr. and Mrs. Whitman and twelve others perished, and which destroyed the mission, and to the rescue of the survivors by the Hudson's Bay Company's efforts; and this though there are in the American Board archives letters written by them to the American Board, between Whitman's return to Oregon, in September, 1843, and May, 1866, amounting to about 250,000 words.

Though thus chary of quoting what C. Eells, H. H. Spalding and W. H. Gray wrote *prior* to the publication of the Whitman Saved Oregon story, in 1864-5-6, Dr. Mowry quotes from their letters, "statements" and other publications *subsequent* to September, 1865, to the following amounts:

From Rev. H. H. Spalding	2,192 words
From Rev. C. Eells	1,453 words
From Mr. W. H. Gray	<u>3,440 words</u>
Total	7,085 words

But neither he nor any other advocate of the Saving Oregon theory of Whitman's ride has ever been able to produce one word written by Rev. E. Walker in support of it, though he lived in Oregon till his death in 1877, and knew exactly as much about the origin and purpose of that ride as any of his associates.

Great as is this amount, it is but a faint index of the extent to which Dr. Mowry uses the statements of Spalding, Gray and C. Eells made *subsequent* to 1864-5, for practically all of his book that relates to Whitman is a mere condensation of, or a paraphrase of those statements, or of the statements of others whose ideas about the matter are plainly derived from Spalding, Gray and C. Eells.

An example of how very peculiar are Dr. Mowry's ideas as to the proper use of "original sources," is found in his Chapter X, "The Missionaries Discuss the Situation," of which he devotes 3 pages to C. Eells' "recollections" (in 1866, and subsequent years down to 1882), which "recollections" (from 24 to 40 years after the event) Mr. Eells did not pretend to support by reference to any contemporaneous letters, journals or other written or printed documents, as to the patriotic origin of Whitman's ride, and of the details of the Special Meeting of the Mission held at Whitman's Station, Sept. 26-27, 1842, which authorized his ride.

But neither in Chapter X, nor elsewhere in the book, does he even allude to the 14-page letter (received by D. Greene, Sec., on May 3, 1843), dated Oct. 3, 1842, in Cushing Eells' handwriting and signed by him (and indexed by the American Board among C. Eells' letters), which has a brief note of endorsement of its correctness in E. Walker's handwriting, and signed by him, which letter contains the *official report* of that Special Meeting of Sept. 26-27, 1842, signed by E. Walker, Moderator, and Cushing Eells, Scribe, which record, written but six days after the close of the meeting, gives only the business of the mission as engaging its attention, without the least intimation that any political or patriotic ideas were even mentioned during its whole session.

Yet knowing well that this record still exists in the archives of the American Board, Dr. Mowry copies without comment (on p. 129) Rev. C. Eells' statement made in 1882, that the record of that Special Meeting was destroyed at the time of the Whitman massacre!

DR. MOWRY'S TREATMENT OF MRS. WHITMAN'S LETTERS.

The *second* such "original source" as to "A" is the correspondence of Mrs. Whitman with her parents, brothers and sisters after March, 1840, when Gray began to bring the quar-

rels of the various members of the mission, (and especially of the Whitmans and Spalding, and himself,) to the attention of the American Board, and prior to her husband's return in September, 1843.

Of this there will be found about 42,000 words in the Trans. Ore. Pioneer Association, 1891 and 1893, and to fairly present the relation of the Hudson's Bay Company to the Spalding-Whitman mission at least 20,000 more words of earlier and later dates should be carefully studied and summarized to the extent of fully 1,000 words, while fully 1,000 words more should be *quoted* from these 20,000. Of the 42,000 above mentioned fully 2,000 should be quoted.

Of these 42,000 words, Dr. Mowry only quotes the following 42 words (p. 122) in a letter to her husband, dated Oct. 22, 1842: "Indeed, much as I shall and do want to see you, I prefer that you stay just as long as it is necessary to accomplish all your heart's desire respecting the interest of this country, so dear to us both, our home."

This brief extract Dr. Mowry declares "Showed what she understood to be the object of his journey."

But *how* this shows "What his heart's desire was," he fails to explain. He nowhere informs his readers where they can find this letter (which is in Trans. Ore. Pioneer Assn., 1891, p. 167).

Between September 29, 1842, and May 18, 1843, Mrs. Whitman wrote five letters, as follows, to her relatives and her husband, in the first two of which she explicitly stated that his journey was on missionary business, and in the other three stated what amounted to the same thing.

Sept. 29, 1842 (the next day after her husband first proposed the journey), she wrote as follows to her brother, at Quincy, Ill.:

"My beloved husband has about concluded to start next Monday to go to the United States. . . . If you are still in Quincy you may not see him until his return, as his business requires great haste. He wishes to reach Boston as early as possible so as to make arrangements to return next summer if prospered. The interests of the missionary cause in this country calls him home." Sept. 30, 1842, she wrote to "My Beloved Parents, Brothers and Sisters: You will be surprised if this letter reaches you to learn that the bearer is my dear husband, and that you will after a few days have the pleasure of seeing him. May you have a joyful meeting. He goes upon important business as connected with the missionary cause, the cause of Christ in this land, which I will leave for him to explain when you see him, because I have not time to enlarge. He has but yesterday fully made up his mind to go, and he wishes to start Monday, and this is Friday,

. . . He has for a companion Mr. Lovejoy, a respectable, intelligent man and a lawyer, but not a Christian, who expects to accompany him all the way to Boston, as his friends are in that region, and perhaps to Washington. . . . He goes with the advice and entire confidence of his brethren in the mission, and who value him not only as an associate, but as their physician, and feel as much as I do, that they know not how to spare him; but the interest of the cause demands the sacrifice on our part; and could you know all the circumstances in the case you would see more clearly how much our hearts are identified in the salvation of the Indians and the interests of the cause generally in this country." (Trans. Ore. Pioneer Assn., 1893, p. 165-9.)

March 11, 1843, she wrote to her sister Harriet, and descanting on the pain of being "so widely and for so long a time" separated from her husband, continued, "For what would you be willing to make such a sacrifice? Is there anything in this lower world that would tempt you to it? I presume not; at least I can see no earthly inducement sufficiently paramount to cause me voluntarily to take upon myself such a painful trial. Painful, I say? Yes, painful in the extreme to the natural heart. But there is one object, our blessed Saviour, for whose sake I trust both you as well as we are willing, if called to it, to suffer all things. It was for Him, for the advancement of His cause, that I could say to my beloved husband, 'Go; take all the time necessary to accomplish His work; and the Lord go with and bless you.'" (Idem., 155.)

April 14, 1843, she wrote to her brother Jonas as follows: "Husband's presence is needed very much at this juncture. A great loss is sustained by his going to the States. I mean a present loss to the station and Indians, but hope and expect a greater good will be accomplished by it. There was no other way for us to do. We felt that we could not remain as we was without more help, and we are so far off that to send by letter and get returns was too slow a way for the present emergency." (Idem. p. 161.) May 18, 1843, she wrote to her husband a letter which followed him to Boston, and reaching there Sept. 6, 1843, when he was six days' journey west of Ft. Hall on his return trip, this letter (which was directed on the outside to Dr. Whitman or Rev. David Greene) was retained there, and is No. 106, of Vol. 138 of the Correspondence of the American Board. In it she wrote "wishing you, my dear husband, as speedy a return to the bosom of your family as the business of the Lord upon which you have gone will admit of." So far as known these five letters are the only ones which Mrs. Whitman ever wrote which stated anything about the origin

and purpose of his ride (and I have quoted all they contain on those points).

Though knowing about all these letters, Dr. Mowry does not even allude to any one of them.

DR. MOWRY'S TREATMENT OF THE FIRST TWO ACCOUNTS OF THE
ORIGIN AND PURPOSE OF WHITMAN'S RIDE EVER PRINTED.

The only remaining "original sources" or contemporaneous accounts of the origin and purpose of Whitman's ride are the two *official* accounts in the *Missionary Herald*—the monthly organ of the American Board—the first in the number for September, 1843, and the second in the number for July, 1848. Neither Dr. Mowry nor any other advocate of the Saving Oregon theory of that ride has ever dared to quote either of these accounts, and I do not believe any advocate of that theory ever will give his readers a chance to read them. No advocate of the Saving Oregon story ever intimated that any such accounts had ever been published till after Mrs. Victor and Elwood Evans in their investigations found and published them, and since then nearly all advocates of the Saving Oregon story, like Barrows, Craighead, Coffin, Nixon, Mowry, Mrs. Eva Emery Dye, Parker, and Penrose have avoided even alluding to these two official accounts of the origin and purpose of that ride. If based only on the correspondence of the mission with the American Board; these (which are not only the first two, but also the only articles ever printed that gave any account of the origin and purpose of that ride till the Saving Oregon theory was published in 1864-5-6) could not be considered as "original sources," since that correspondence is still in existence (though all its vital parts have always been carefully suppressed by all the advocates of the Saving Oregon story), but as these two accounts might have been based to some extent on what Whitman himself said, when in Boston, March 30-April 8, 1843, they are fairly entitled to rank as "original sources."

The first account is as follows: "It was stated in the last Annual Report that the Southern Branch of this Mission, embracing the stations at Wailatpu, near Walla Walla, and Clear Water and Kamiah, higher up on the waters of Snake River, had been discontinued, but at a special meeting of the mission, held last October, to consider this decision, it was thought advisable that Dr. Whitman should personally communicate the condition and prospects of these stations to the Prudential Committee. After a long and toilsome journey he reached Boston, early in the spring; and, upon hearing the representations which he made, it was resolved to sustain the operations of the mission without any material change. An-

other object of Dr. Whitman in making the above mentioned journey was to procure additional laborers. He desired also to induce Christian families to emigrate and settle in the vicinity of the different stations, that they might relieve the missionary of his secular responsibilities, and also contribute directly in various ways to the social and moral improvement of the Indians. How far his wishes in those particulars will be responded to is uncertain." (Miss. Herald, September, 1843, p. 356.) This did not appear till after the receipt by D. Greene, Secretary, of Rev. C. Eells' letter of Oct. 3, 1842, endorsed by Rev. E. Walker, which contained the official report of that Special Meeting, and of Walker's letter of Oct. 3, 1842, endorsed by C. Eells as correct, and also of Walker's letter of Feb. 28, 1843, complaining that Whitman started to the States without waiting for their letters, as he had agreed to do, and also H. H. Spalding's long letter of defense and justification of Oct. 15, 1842, as the endorsement of D. Greene, secretary, on these several letters shows. This first published account of the origin and purpose of the ride agrees exactly with the account given in the letters for which Whitman did not wait, and is absolutely irreconcilable with the account Rev. C. Eells gave in his various "statements" in 1866, 1878 and 1883. Turning to p. 193 of the Annual Report of the American Board for 1842 we find that not only were these three out of the four stations discontinued, but that both Rev. H. H. Spalding and Mr. W. H. Gray were recalled to the States by the order of February, 1842. Yet Gray, in 1885, wrote that he had no personal knowledge of that order, or of its being talked about at the Special Meeting of Sept. 26-27, 1842. (Cf. Gray's article in the Oregonian of Feb. 1, 1885, reprinted in "The Whitman Controversy" (pamphlet), Portland, Ore., 1885).

The second account is in the Missionary Herald for July, 1848, in the brief sketch of his life (containing only 162 words), prefacing the account of the massacre, and merely says, "He made a visit to the Atlantic States in the Spring of 1843, being called hither by the business of the mission."

Not another word about Whitman's ride was printed in this official organ of the American Board till in December, 1866, 18 years and five months later, it published and endorsed Rev. C. Eells' version of its origin and purpose.

This second account was published two years after the treaty of 1846 had settled the boundary of Oregon at 49 degrees, and the editors of the Missionary Herald knew that in chronicling the massacre they were also chronicling the final destruction of their Oregon Mission. Who can doubt that with the memory of Whitman's visit only five years before fresh in their minds, and with all the correspondence of the mission and the records of the action of the Board thereon open to their inspec-

tion, they knew, and in this short sentence stated exactly what caused his ride, and who can doubt that if they could honestly have claimed that that ride had any political significance, or had saved any, even the smallest part of Oregon to the nation, they would then have stated it, when the whole country was stirred with sympathetic sorrow over the bloody tragedy which had destroyed their Oregon Mission? This second account of the origin and purpose of Whitman's ride, containing only 22 words, neither Dr. Mowry nor any other advocate of the Saving Oregon theory of that ride has ever quoted, and I think no one of them has ever even intimated that any such account was ever printed.

DR. MOWRY'S TREATMENT OF WHITMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE
AFTER HIS RETURN TO OREGON.

Whitman's letters after his return to Oregon cannot be considered as "original sources" as to the *origin and purpose* of that ride, since his frigid reception by the Secretary of the American Board (who told him he was sorry that he had come), and the fact that the next month after he started on that journey the Indians burned his rude grist mill and a large quantity of grain, involving him in so much expense to rebuild, that, with the expenses of his journey, he was troubled for two years after his return in his settlements with the American Board, as he states in his letter of April 13, 1846, (which Dr. Mowry refrains from even alluding to), together with the fact that the decadence of the mission which had begun as early as 1839, continued to progress towards its complete destruction so steadily and with such frightful rapidity that on May 20, 1845, less than 20 months after his return, Whitman himself, having been directed at a full meeting of the Mission (at which all were present except Mr. Spalding), held at Whitman's Station, and which closed May 14, 1845, to write to D. Greene, Sec., as to the state of the mission, etc., was compelled to write: "The state of the mission is such as to give no very decided promise of permanency or of much good." All these things subjected Whitman to *very* strong temptation to exaggerate the importance of his ride, and its influence on the destiny of Oregon, so that he naturally strove to convince the Secretary of the Board that though the mission (whose continuance had been secured only by that ride), seemed destined soon to be a dismal failure, yet his expensive disobedience to the positive order of the Board in making that ride had, somehow, resulted in such benefit to Oregon as justified the expense of the ride and the resulting continuance of the mission.

An indispensable postulate of the Whitman Saved Oregon story being that the mission was of immense benefit to the

natives, and continued in a flourishing condition until it was destroyed by the Whitman massacre of November, 1847, which massacre all the advocates of the Whitman Legend represent as falling on a flourishing and successful mission, while Spalding and Gray (two of the chief witnesses on whom Dr. Mowry and all other advocates of the Whitman Saved Oregon story rely) declared that it was instigated by the Hudson Bay Company, and the Catholics, (which charge was as atrocious and as inexcusable a slander as ever was uttered,) neither Dr. Mowry nor any other advocate of the Whitman Saved Oregon story has ever quoted one sentence of any of the scores of pages of the contemporaneous correspondence and diaries of the mission, which establish beyond dispute that it was in a state of decadence really as early as 1839-40, and steadily and rapidly went down from that time onward, so that if there had been no Whitman massacre the mission in all probability would soon have been abandoned, as the Methodist Mission to the Oregon Indians had already been.

Want of space prevents further discussion of these points here, but in my forthcoming book I devote a chapter to "The Long Suppressed Evidence on the Decadence of the Whitman-Spalding-Eells-Walker Mission," and another to "The Long Suppressed Evidence on the True Causes of the Whitman Massacre," and the readers of them will find them quite as startling as the chapter on "The Long Suppressed Evidence as to the Origin and Purpose of Whitman's ride."

Sixteen of Whitman's letters between Nov. 1, 1843, and Oct. 18, 1847, aggregating about 26,000 to 28,000 words, are in the archives of the American Board.

Although in several of these letters Whitman made very extravagant and wholly unwarranted claims of great services rendered to the National Government, it is a *very* significant fact that in none of them, nor in any of his letters to his friends, nor in any of Mrs. Whitman's to her friends, is there any claim that he ever had had any interview with President Tyler, or Secretary Webster, or that he had ever received any promise of any assistance from them, or from any officer of the National Government, or that he had communicated any information of any importance to the Government, or had published in newspapers or otherwise any such information, or held any meetings to promote migration to Oregon, or that he had had anything to do with originating or organizing the migration of 1843, but only, at first, in November, 1843, that he was "instrumental in leading the 1843 migration," and later that he "led" that migration, and though he claims, (what is manifestly incorrect,) that the migration of 1843 was a decisive factor in bringing about the treaty of 1846, he nowhere, save in his letter of April 1, 1847,—four and one-half years after he started on

his ride,—claims that his ride had any other *purpose* than missionary business.

Dr. Mowry's treatment of this letter illustrates his ideas of going to "original sources wherever practicable."

On pp. 198-9 he says: "In another letter" (whose date he does not give), "to Mr. Greene, is the following: 'It was to open a practical (practicable) route and safe passage, and secure a favorable report of the journey from emigrants, which, in connection with other objects caused me to leave my family and brave the toils and dangers of the journey, notwithstanding the unusual severity of the winter, and the great depth of snow.'

"Then he mentions the 'saving the mission from being broken up, as 'another' object of his journey."

But instead of going to the "original source" for this inaccurate and deceptive quotation, Dr. Mowry has copied it *verbatim* (and without credit), from an article defending the Whitman Saved Oregon story (by Rev. Dr. Laurie, the official historian of the American Board), in the *Missionary Herald*, for September, 1885, p. 350.

Going to the "original source," to wit.: Whitman's own letter (covering 7 pages large sized letter paper), in the archives of the American Board, we find the following, viz.:

"It was to open a practical route and safe passage and to secure a favorable report of the journey from immigrants, which, in connection with other objects, caused me to leave my family and brave the toils and dangers of the journey, which carried me on, notwithstanding I was forced out of my direct track, and notwithstanding the unusual severity of the winter and great depth of snow.

"In connection with this let me say, the other great object for which I went was to save the mission from being broken up just then, which it must have been, as you will see by a reference to the doings of the Committee" (i. e., the Prudential Committee of the American Board), "which confirmed the recall of Mr. Spalding only two weeks before my arrival in Boston. I often reflect upon the fact that you told me you were sorry I came. . . . It may not be inappropriate to observe that at that moment the Methodist Mission, as well as our own, was on the point of dissolution."

Every other advocate of the Whitman Legend who has quoted from this letter has refrained, as carefully as Dr. Mowry has, from making a fair quotation from it, so that this is the first chance the public has ever had to read exactly what Whitman wrote three and one-half years after his return to Oregon, and *all* that has been found that he ever wrote, making any claim that anything other than the business of saving the mission from destruction impelled him to make his ride.

If the reader will now turn to Whitman's letters of May 12, 27, 28 and 30, 1843 (pp. 37-8 *infra.*), he will discover exactly how much (or rather how very little) was Whitman's interest in leading a migration to Oregon at the very time when it was gathering and starting.

Presumably (though he has not accurately quoted this letter) Dr. Mowry knows its contents, and presumably also he knows perfectly well the contents of Mrs. Whitman's letter of April 14, 1843 (quoted on p. 17 *ante*, but), to which he does not allude. Yet, notwithstanding Whitman in this one explicitly declares that the mission would have been broken up "just then" if he had not made the ride, and Mrs. Whitman wrote, "There was no other way for us to do, we felt that we could not remain, as we was without more help, and we were so far off that to send by letter was too slow a way for the present emergency." Dr. Mowry (carefully suppressing this strictly contemporaneous evidence of the two people who knew best about the urgency of the mission business in causing Whitman to make his winter's ride) says (p. 131), "But if this" (*i. e.*, the business of the mission) "was the only motive for that hazardous journey, why should he not have waited until spring? It seems quite clear that a summer trip across the continent would have accomplished that end just as well," and (p. 188), "Had his purpose been confined solely to the affairs of the mission he could have waited until spring, and made the journey during the summer months."

AS TO "B."

Three indispensable postulates of Dr. Mowry's claim that Whitman "wrested that entire country" (*i. e.*, the old Oregon Territory) "from the Hudson's Bay Company" are:

First. That as late as March, 1843, that "entire country" *i. e.*, the present states of Oregon, Washington and Idaho, together with about 28,000 square miles of Northwestern Montana and about 13,000 square miles of Northwestern Wyoming, in all about 292,000 square miles, or nearly one-twelfth of all our territory on this continent, was in controversy between the United States and Great Britain.

Yet knowing perfectly well that in 1824 and again in 1827 England offered us the line of 49 degrees to the most north-eastern branch of the Columbia, and thence the river to the Pacific, which left *really* in dispute not "that entire country," but only about 55,000 to 58,000 square miles, or less than one-fifth of "that entire country," being only that part of Washington north and west of the Columbia, and that we both times immediately refused this offer and insisted on 49 degrees to the Coast, Dr. Mowry deems it consistent with his duty as an "impartial historian" to suppress all mention of

these offers of England, and of the fact that in 1825 the Hudson's Bay Company "officially notified" Dr. McLoughlin, their superintendent in charge of the Oregon region from 1824 to 1845, that "in no event could the British claim extend south of the Columbia," and also to suppress all mention of the fact that Lord Ashburton came over in April, 1842, "specifically authorized," as we shall see later, to renew to us the offer made us in the negotiations of 1824 and 1827, and also to suppress all mention of the fact that in 1826, when not only all the region north of Missouri and west of the Mississippi River, but also everything else north and west of Illinois and Michigan was not even organized as a territory, but was an unbroken wilderness, we notified England that "49 degrees was our ultimatum for the northern boundary of Oregon."

Second. That England could by making settlements and establishing trading posts subsequent to Oct. 20, 1818 (the date of the first of our treaties of "joint policy" relating to Oregon), strengthen her claim to it while the treaty of 1818 and its renewal in 1827 remained in force.

In support of his repeated assertions that England could do this and that the Hudson's Bay Company were actively engaged in doing it, Dr. Mowry quotes, not the Presidents, Secretaries of State and Ministers to England who negotiated for us on the Oregon boundary, all of whom held that England could *not* do this, but his favorite "original authorities" on the history and diplomacy of Oregon—Rev. H. H. Spalding, Rev. C. Eells and Mr. W. H. Gray.

But the very terms of those treaties made such strengthening of her claims impossible, a position not only always held by every one of our diplomatists and Presidents who negotiated on the Oregon question—James Monroe, John Q. Adams, Albert Gallatin, Andrew Jackson, Edward Livingston, Martin Van Buren, John Tyler, Edward Everett, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, James Buchanan, James K. Polk and George Bancroft—and also by many others of our most eminent statesmen, but also tacitly admitted by *all* the British diplomatists who negotiated on it, no one of whom ever ventured to assert that such settlements and trading posts had made the British claim one whit stronger than it was Oct. 20, 1818, and also *explicitly* assented to by Lord Aberdeen (head of the British Foreign Office from 1841 to 1846), in two interviews with Edward Everitt in November and December, 1843. (Cf. on this the authorities cited in *Trans. Am. Hist. Assn.* for 1900, p. 223 *infra*, and *Berlin Arbitration*, p. 126.)

Third. That as late as March, 1843, the Government and the people of the country thought Oregon worthless because the Rocky and Blue Mountains were supposed to be impassable for wagons. To support this Dr. Mowry offers not a sen-

tence from any Congressional Debate on Oregon, nor from any report of a Congressional Committee on Oregon, nor from any report of any Government Explorer of Oregon, nor from any book of travels or magazine article about Oregon printed prior to the invention of the Whitman Saved Oregon story, in 1864-5, but quotes his favorite "original sources" for Oregon history, to wit.: Rev. H. H. Spalding's, Rev. C. Eells' and W. H. Gray's alleged "recollections" from 1864 to 1882, and the "recollections" of others whose ideas are plainly mere echoes of Spalding, C. Eells and Gray.

Prior to March, 1843, the Oregon Territory had been far more extensively and thoroughly explored and reported on (in government reports, books of travel and magazine articles) by our citizens, both government expeditions and private citizens; more often and more thoroughly debated in Congress; the subject of more numerous and elaborate reports of congressional committees; the object of more and more important diplomatic negotiations, than any other territorial acquisition we have made on this continent had been up to the date of its full accomplishment; and to the Oregon acquisition there was far less opposition—in Congress and out of it—than to that of any other of these acquisitions except Florida.

Oregon had been discussed at seventeen sessions of Congress, between 1821 and March 1, 1843. In these debates it was repeatedly declared, beginning as early as 1824, that Oregon was easily accessible by wagons over the low passes of the Rocky Mountains, even without any expenditure for road making.

The official record of these debates covers 300 columns, or about 250,000 words in "Annals of Congress," "Debates in Congress," and "Congressional Globe."

Yet Dr. Mowry deems it consistent with his duty as an "impartial historian" not only not to quote one word of all these debates, but not even to mention the above official reports (which are the only "original sources" for these debates).

To these seventeen sessions there were made eleven reports of committees of the Senate or House of Representatives, and besides there were read in the Senate or House the reports of special agents J. B. Provost (1822), Lieut. W. A. Slacum, of the navy (sent to Oregon by the state department by order of President Jackson in 1835, with special instructions to examine and report on everything important for our government to know about Oregon), whose report was read in the Senate in 1837, and was often referred to and quoted in later congressional discussions and in congressional committee reports, and of Secretary of War Poinsett, in 1840, recommending the establishment of a line of military posts from the Missouri River to the mouth of the Columbia.

There was also the report of Captain Bonneville to the Secretary of War, in 1835, reporting his success in driving twenty loaded wagons through the South Pass over the Rockies and into the Oregon Territory to Green River, in 1832, popularized by Irving's "Bonneville," published in New York and also in England, in 1837, and very widely read in both countries.

All these committee reports were unanimous, all enthusiastic as to the great value of Oregon to us, and the validity of our title at least as far north as 49 degrees, and each was unanimously adopted by the body to which it was made.

As early as 1831 the report of the military committee of the Senate contained the letter of the Rocky Mountain Fur Company to the Secretary of War, dated October 29, 1830, stating that in the preceding five years with from eighty to one hundred men, divided into small parties, they had explored the whole region beyond the Rockies from the Gulf of California to the mouth of the Columbia, and had made discoveries and acquired information they deemed it important to communicate to the government. Then, after describing their driving ten wagons loaded with from 1,800 to 2,000 pounds each from St. Louis to the east end of the South Pass and back to St. Louis between April 10 and October 10, 1830, they continue: "This is the first time wagons ever went to the Rocky Mountains, and the ease with which it was done proves the facility of communicating overland with the Pacific, the route beyond the mountains to the Great Falls of the Columbia being easier than on this side."

The Great Falls of the Columbia are not only west of the Blue Mountains, but more than one hundred miles west of where Whitman six years later established his mission; and this letter of the Rocky Mountain Fur Company was often referred to and quoted in later congressional committee reports and debates, and in books, newspapers and magazine articles before 1843.

These fifteen reports covered about 600 pages, or 350,000 to 375,000 words, but of them all Doctor Mowry, as an "impartial historian," only *names* three, and only quotes from one—Cushing's, in 1839—to the extent of 297 words, and that only on the wholly unimportant point of whether or not Oregon was included in the Louisiana purchase, while he omits to even allude anywhere in his book to Lieutenant Slacum, or to Poinsett's report, or to the Rocky Mountain Fur Company's wagons in 1830, and their extensive explorations in Oregon before 1830, or to Bonneville proving Oregon easily accessible by wagons in 1832, or to the fact that Whitman, in 1835, wrote (in a letter heretofore carefully suppressed) of Bonneville's wagons, and that the route presented little difficulty for wagons; and though quoting freely from Gray's and Spalding's

declarations in 1864-5 to 1882 that the route to Oregon was deemed impracticable for wagons as late as 1843, he omits to quote from Spalding's letter of September 20, 1836 (published in the *Missionary Herald*, October, 1837, and giving an account of the overland journey of the Spalding-Whitman party in 1836), the following: "We drove a wagon to Snake Fort" (i. e., Fort Boise) "and could have driven it through but for the fatigue of our animals. We expect to get it at some future time."

Before March 1, 1843, in presidential messages, or in instructions to diplomats negotiating with England or Russia about Oregon, or in other executive papers, or in correspondence which has been in print for fifteen to fifty years past, or in reports of negotiations on Oregon, or in debates in Congress, or in reports of congressional committees, the following statesmen are on record as holding that Oregon was of great value to the United States, and could be easily occupied by us, while it was practically impossible (as the world then was) for any European power to people it, and that our title was unquestionable at least as far north as 49 degrees, and that we should insist on not accepting any line south of 49 degrees as the north boundary of Oregon, viz.:

Ten men who have been presidents, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, J. Q. Adams, Jackson, Van Buren, Tyler, Polk, Pierce and Buchanan; also Calhoun and King, vice-presidents (as had been also Jefferson and Van Buren); also Webster, Clay, Everett, Forsyth, secretaries of state (as had been also Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, J. Q. Adams, Van Buren, Calhoun, Livingston and Buchanan); Gallatin, R. Rush, Livingston and Everett, ministers to England (as were also J. Q. Adams, Van Buren and Buchanan); also Middleton, Cambreling and Ingersoll, ministers to Russia, and Archer, Baylies, Benton, Berrien, Lewis Cass, Rufus Choate, Caleb Cushing, John J. Crittenden, Drayton, Floyd, John Reed of Massachusetts ("the life member"), Reynolds, Rives, Sevier, Tappan, J. W. Taylor of New York, R. J. Walker, Woodbury and many others of lesser note, while not a single authentic sentence has ever been produced from any man of importance enough ever to have been president or vice-president, or minister to England or Russia, or secretary of state, or even a senator for as much as one full term, which expressed any doubt of our title to all of Oregon south of 49 degrees, or which intimated that we would surrender anything to Great Britain south of 49 degrees.

It is true that Tyler had, to use his own words, "a dream of policy never embodied," about selling that part of the present state of Washington north and west of the Columbia River to England for a good round sum; but this wholly impossible

"dream of policy" necessarily implied not surrendering it, but insisting on 49 degrees as our line to the coast, since England certainly would not *buy* what we did not *own*.

But no reader of Doctor Mowry's book, or of any other book advocating the Whitman legend, will find in it any intimation of these indisputable facts about the position of our leading statesmen on the Oregon question.

A detailed criticism of Doctor Mowry's treatment of all the "original sources" as to "B" would require very much more space than is available, and as no one has ever pretended that Whitman could by any possibility have influenced the Oregon policy of any other administration than that of Tyler, we will conclude this part of the criticism with a brief examination of his treatment of "original sources" as to the attitude toward and actions upon the Oregon question of President Tyler and Secretary of State D. Webster *prior* to March 1, 1843.

On pages 170-71 Doctor Mowry positively asserts that Webster and Tyler thought in the spring of 1843 that Oregon was useless to the United States, because "Lord Ashburton, Sir George Simpson and others with British proclivities had thoroughly indoctrinated our statesmen with the idea that the Rocky Mountains were impassable to wagons, that Oregon could not be peopled from the States, and therefore its value to this country was very small."

The reader looks through his book from title page to finis in vain for a single sentence in support of this shocking impeachment of the patriotism and the knowledge of our statesmen, except what Rev. H. H. Spalding, Rev. C. Eells and W. H. Gray thought they remembered (from twenty-three to forty years after the event) that Whitman told them after his return from the States.

Not a word is there in Doctor Mowry's book which intimates that either Webster or Tyler had ever taken the slightest interest in the Oregon question, or had done or said a thing toward securing Oregon to the United States or had any special information about it till Whitman reached Washington, certainly not till late in March, and more likely not till April 10 to 15, 1843.

Let us examine the official records and learn the facts.

1. In both his first and second annual messages in December, 1841, and December, 1842, President Tyler had strong paragraphs on Oregon, in the first recommending the establishment of a line of military posts from the Missouri to the Columbia. To neither of these messages does Doctor Mowry even allude.

2. Elijah White, M. D., had been a Methodist missionary to the Oregon Indians, and stationed nearly 300 miles west of Whitman's mission, from 1838 to 1840, when he was discharged.

In January, 1842 (as we know from contemporaneous written and printed sources), Doctor White appeared in Washington with letters of introduction from Daniel Webster's eldest son to President Tyler, Secretary Webster and Secretary of the Navy A. P. Upshur, and after interviews with them, and with Secretary of War John C. Spencer, and Senator Linn and other friends of Oregon, by order of the president he was commissioned Indian sub-agent for the region west of the Rockies, and directed to raise as large a company as possible and proceed with them to Oregon, which he did, starting from near Westport, Mo., May 16, 1842, as the leader of the first large overland migration consisting of 112 persons.

He remained in Oregon some three years, and was the only official ever commissioned by our government to reside in Oregon, till after the territory was organized in 1848. Being a very "shifty" and selfish politician, White became exceedingly unpopular and consequently his work for Oregon has received very scant mention.

There is no doubt but what a very large part—if not all—of the *honest* advocacy of the Whitman Saved Oregon story has resulted from transferring to Doctor Whitman the claims which Doctor White made, of the influence on Tyler's Oregon policy, of his interviews with President Tyler and Secretary Webster, just before Ashburton's arrival in Washington, though there is not the slightest reason for believing that Doctor White any more than Dr. Whitman really affected in any way the Oregon policy of the national government.

How does Doctor Mowry treat this matter? Though he mentions "White's Travels in Oregon" (published 1848), in his list of authorities, he does not quote one word from it, and nowhere gives his readers any intimation that Doctor White had ever been a missionary to the Oregon Indians, or was ever in Oregon before the autumn of 1842, or that he ever was in Washington, or ever saw President Tyler and Secretary Webster, or that he held any official position in Oregon, but only says of him (p. 188): "Doctor White, with a considerable party of settlers, arrived near Whitman's station early in September" (1842).

3. When in August, 1838, Lieut. Charles Wilkes set sail with six ships and nearly 600 men in command of the greatest exploring expedition our government has ever sent out, Van Buren's administration gave him positive instructions to spend six months in exploring "our territory on the northwest coast of America," and the Columbia River, and the coast of California as far south as San Francisco Bay.

April 28, 1841, twenty-four days after Harrison's untimely death brought Tyler to the presidency, Wilkes, with part of his squadron, sighted the mouth of the Columbia, and

with a "sloop of war, a brig of war, two launches, ten boats, and upward of 300 men" he was busily engaged till October 10, 1841, in a far more extensive and thorough exploration of Oregon by land and water than any other single expedition has ever made, even to this day. He surveyed and chartered Puget's Sound and the navigable waters of the Columbia, visited all the mission stations of the Methodists and of the American Board, and all of the posts of the Hudson's Bay Company south of 49 degrees, except Hall and Boise (which hundreds of Americans had visited), and all the settlements in Oregon.

He sent a party from Puget's Sound eastward to the Columbia and back to the sound by a different route, through the center of the region north and west of the Columbia (being all that was really in dispute, and) of the real value of which (according to Spalding's letter of April 7, 1846, edited by Whitman, and published in Palmer's Journal in 1847) the missionaries of the American Board knew absolutely nothing until the party sent from the settlements in the Willamette Valley explored it in the autumn of 1845, i. e., three years after Whitman started to the States.

He also sent a party overland from the Columbia up the Willamette and down the Sacramento to San Francisco.

He dropped anchor at New York June 10, 1842, and three days later filed in the navy department a most enthusiastic "special report" on Oregon (covering 44 pages foolscap), urging the immense value of the Puget's Sound region, and declaring that in Oregon a man could make a living and acquire wealth with only one-third the labor required in the States, and that "No portion of the world beyond the tropics can be found that will yield so readily with moderate labor to the wants of man" as the Oregon territory would.

These statements,—as powerful stimulants to migration as could well be imagined,—with enough more to make 14 pages the House of Representatives took, and on January 4, 1843 (when Whitman was near Bent's Fort), added it to the 64 pages of the Report of the Military Committee of the House on Oregon (of which 5,000 copies had been printed in May, 1842), and ordered another edition of 5,000 copies printed.

In a part of this Special Report which was *not* printed, in discussing passes over the Rocky Mountains, Wilkes wrote: "Finally the two southern routes, which are preferable, susceptible of being used at almost all seasons, and a good wagon road may be constructed with little expense. . . It is readily to be perceived that the difficulty of communication with the Territory is far less for us than for the British." There was no need for our government to print this, because it had

printed the same matter substantially in Congressional Debates and Committee Reports many times during the preceding 18 years.

How does Dr. Mowry treat this matter? On pp. 190-191 he has appropriated (without permission from and without credit to the author), a page from a copyrighted manuscript sent him in 1899, by the writer of this criticism, which page does not quote one word from Wilkes' Report, but merely states my inferences (written on first reading the manuscript of this Special Report in 1887, at the Navy Department), as to why the Administration would not allow the *whole* report to be printed in 1843; but though the immediate context of this page of my inferences in the manuscript sent him contained copious quotations from this Special Report of Wilkes, and from his other unpublished dispatches, giving full information about Oregon and the operations and aims of the Hudson's Bay Company, Dr. Mowry not only nowhere copies one word of that context, but he nowhere quotes one word from any of Wilkes' Reports, nor prints one word which will give his readers any information as to the cause of, the time of, or the extent and values of Wilkes' explorations of Oregon, or of the time when he filed this Special Report, or of the fact that for nine months before Whitman could by any possibility have reached Washington, Tyler's Administration could, on any day, have had interviews with Wilkes and the other officers of his expedition, who knew a vast deal more about all of Oregon than was really in dispute than *all* the missionaries—Methodist and American Board put together,—did then, or for many years after.

The facts about Wilkes' exploration and Special Report are so completely destructive of that essential postulate of the Whitman Legend that the Government at Washington was indifferent as to the fate of Oregon, and ignorant as to its value, that not a single advocate of that Legend has ever given his readers any information of the slightest consequence about Wilkes, and most of them (including the two latest advocates of the Legend, Johnson's "Century of Expansion," and Carpenter's "the American Advance,") do not even mention his name!

Gray and Mrs. Dye, carefully refraining from stating anything of any real value about Wilkes' work, wantonly slander him as follows: "To the disgrace of the leader of that squadron, the general impression of all the early settlers of this country is, to the present day, that he understood and tasted the qualities of Dr. McLoughlin's liquors, and received the polite attentions of the gentlemen of the Hudson's Bay Company with far more pleasure than he looked into or regarded

the wants of this infant settlement of his countrymen." (Cf. Gray's History of Oregon, p. 204.)

"'Dr. McLoughlin's wine has affected his judgment,' said the men of the mission."

Then representing Wilkes as conversing with George Abernethy, the steward of the Methodist Mission (who had then been in Oregon less than a year and a half), Mrs. Dye continues: "'Tell me, what do you Americans think of the Hudson's Bay Company?'"

"'The Hudson's Bay Company is Great Britain's instrumentality for securing Oregon,' was the answer."

"'But,' urged the commodore, 'the missionaries have received untold favors from the Hudson's Bay Company, and if they are gentlemen it is their duty to return them.'"

"The missionary faced about in the commodore's path. 'Return them? Certainly. I will exchange favors with Dr. McLoughlin or any other man or set of men, but *I will not sell country for it.*'"

"Wilkes was almost angry with this blunt missionary." (Cf. McLoughlin and Old Oregon, pp. 176-7.)

There is not the remotest probability that any part of this dialogue ever was spoken, or that there is a shadow of foundation for it, except in Mrs. Dye's unrestrained imagination.

(4) In April, 1842, Lord Ashburton arrived in Washington, and (after various informal conferences) on June 13, 1842, (the very day Wilkes filed his Special Report on Oregon in the Navy Department), began the *formal* negotiations which ended August 9, with the signing of the Webster-Ashburton treaty.

As it was generally understood that he was to treat on *all* points in dispute, there was much disappointment that Oregon was not included in the treaty, but though Benton on this account assailed it most bitterly in the Senate, he could only rally 9 votes against it to 39 for it.

In December, 1842, Benton returned to the subject, and asserted that Webster had proposed to accept of the line of the Columbia instead of standing firmly for 49 degrees to the Pacific. To this partisan accusation Webster could not in person reply in the Senate Chamber, but, fortunately for the vindication of the truth of history, his life-long friend, Rufus Choate, had succeeded him in the Senate, and twice, on January 18 and February 3, 1843, while Whitman (of whose existence even there is no evidence that either Tyler or Webster was then aware) was riding east across what is now Kansas, Choate, replying to Benton's accusations, said (on January 18), as summarized by the official reporter in Congressional Globe, 27th Congress, 3d Session, pp. 171-2): "In commenting upon the speech of the Senator from Missouri, (Mr. Benton), who

had preceded him, he took occasion to remove an erroneous impression, which, he conceived, was calculated to do great injustice to a distinguished man, Mr. Webster, who could not there defend himself. He alluded to the fears expressed by the Senator from Missouri, that . . . the rumor must be correct which had got abroad, that a proposition had been made or entertained by the Secretary of State, to settle down upon the Columbia River as the boundary line. Now he was glad to have it in his power to undeceive the Senator, and to assure him, which he did from authority, for he had been requested by the Secretary himself to do it for him, that he never either made or entertained a proposition to admit of any line south of the 49th parallel of latitude, as a negotiable boundary line for the territory of the United States."

On February 3, 1843, Mr. Choate made another speech (which was printed verbatim in *Cong. Globe*, App. pages 222-229), and returning to the subject of Benton's accusations, he said: "I desired chiefly to assure the Senator and the Senate that the apprehension intimated by him that a disclosure of these informal communications would disgrace the American Secretary, by showing that he had offered a boundary line south of the parallel of 49 degrees is totally unfounded. He would be glad to hear me say that I am authorized and desired to declare, that in no communication, formal or informal, was such an offer made, and that none such was ever meditated."

Precisely why Oregon was not included in the Ashburton treaty could not be stated with due regard to the diplomatic proprieties, either by Choate in 1843, or Webster in his great speech in defense of the Ashburton treaty in 1846, nor by Everett, his life-long friend, in his brief biography of Webster, in which all he says is "Had he (i. e., Webster) supposed an arrangement could have been effected on this basis" (i. e., 49 degrees to the coast) "with Lord Ashburton, he would gladly have included it in the treaty of Washington" (Cf. Webster's Works, Vol. 1, Introduction page CXLVIII), because Ashburton's instructions on Oregon were not printed by the British government and reprinted by our government in "Berlin Arbitration" till 1871-2. These instructions authorized Ashburton to offer: (1) The line of the Columbia River from its mouth to the Snake, and thence due east to the summit of the Rockies. This would have given us about nine-fourteenths of the territory south of 49 degrees.

If he could not secure that line he was (2) authorized to renew the offer made us in 1824 and 1827 by England, of the line of 49 degrees from the summit of the Rockies to the most northeasterly branch of the Columbia, and from thence the river to the ocean, which would have given us a trifle more than four-fifths of the territory south of 49 degrees, and

(3) he was positively forbidden to accept of the line of 49 degrees to the coast. (Cf. "Berlin Arbitration," pages 218-219.)

The writer hereof called Dr. Mowry's attention, in 1887, to these positive denials by Webster himself through his life-long friend Choate of that totally false charge that in the Winter of 1842-43 and Spring of 1843 Webster was indifferent as to the acquisition of Oregon, which is the very cornerstone of the Whitman Saved Oregon story, and has called his attention to them several times since, but he never refers to them, but claims on the "memories" of Gray, Spalding and C. Eells that Webster, in March, 1843, thought Oregon worthless to us.

(5) In the winter of 1842-43 there was a great debate on Linn's bill for the occupation of Oregon in the Senate (which, it must never be forgotten, is a part of the treaty-making power in our government), the report of which fills 165 columns of the Congressional Globe and its appendix, and in which out of 50 Senators 27 took part, and but one—McDuffie of South Carolina—spoke depreciatingly of Oregon, and he had then only been a member of the Senate 22 days, having been elected to serve for four years of a vacancy caused by death, and he was never able to secure re-election.

Over and over again it was declared in this debate, alike by those who favored and those who opposed the pending bill, that "The Senate was unanimous in the opinion that our title to Oregon was incontestable at least as far north as 49 degrees,"—even McDuffie asserted this,—and the chief opposition to the bill was from strong friends of the Oregon acquisition, who feared that to pass it without first giving the twelve months' notice (which was all that was needed to abrogate the treaty of 1827) would be such an unjustifiable action as to cause Great Britain to declare war, and that we might thereby run great risk of losing Oregon. The bill passed the Senate February 3, 1843, by 24 to 22, and of the four absentees two were declared to favor and two to oppose it. But when we come to analyze the vote, we find that of the 22 voting "No" nine had declared in their speeches that if the provisions which were in plain violation of the treaty of 1827 were dropped, they would support it, so that, without knowing on what grounds the other 13 voted "No," it is certain that 24 plus 9 plus 2 equals 35, or one more than two-thirds of the entire Senate, were ready on February 3, 1843, to vote for any legislation about Oregon which we had a right to pass without first giving the twelve months' notice and abrogating the treaty which preserved our rights to the territory and prevented Great Britain from strengthening its claims while the treaty remained in force. How does Dr. Mowry treat this great debate, in which occurred Webster's twice repeated explicit denial (by the mouth of Choate) of Benton's slanderous and baseless accusation that

Webster was ready to accept the Columbia or some other line south of 49 degrees as the north boundary of Oregon, which is the very cornerstone of the Whitman Saved Oregon story?

He neither quotes a word from this debate, nor gives any intimation of its importance, and only says (p. 189): "During the winter of 1842-3 a great debate on the Oregon question took place in the Senate, which lasted a number of weeks, and brought out a great diversity of views concerning the Oregon question."

Unable to find a sentence of any contemporaneous government document or letter, or even newspaper statement, that Whitman ever had any interview with President Tyler or Secretary Webster, or that he in the least degree influenced the Oregon policy of Tyler's administration, after quoting freely from the unsupported "recollections" of Gray, Spalding, C. Eells, Dr. Geiger and others between 1865 and 1882 as to what they thought Whitman had told them in 1843 to 1847, Dr. Mowry prints on pages 172-3 a letter dated June 6, 1898, from Dr. L. G. Tyler, President of William and Mary College, Virginia, and some extracts from his "Letters and Times of the Tylers," which he declares establish his claims about Whitman having interviewed Tyler and influenced his Oregon policy.

Not only are the letter and the quotations entirely inconclusive, but less than a year after the date of that letter he quotes, the writer of this review furnished to President L. G. Tyler extensive typewritten copies of the correspondence of Whitman and his associates with the American Board, which Dr. Mowry and the other advocates of the Whitman Legend have so carefully suppressed, and also full information about Dr. White and his work for Oregon (of which he wrote me that he had never heard before), with the result that he was speedily convinced that both he and his half-brother, John Tyler, Jr., private secretary to President John Tyler, had been imposed upon by Barrows' "Oregon" (which was published in 1883) and read by them just before he had his first conversation about Whitman with John Tyler, Jr.), and had confounded Dr. White with Dr. Whitman; and that Dr. Whitman had no influence on the Oregon policy of President Tyler.

(Cf. the review of "The Marcus Whitman Legend," by Professor Hodder, in the *Dial* for January 16, 1902, in which (p. 42) Professor Hodder writes, "That Dr. Tyler does not regard it" (i. e., what Dr. Mowry has quoted from him) "as sustaining the claim that Whitman influenced the administration, appears from a recent letter to the writer of this review, in which he says, 'I do not believe that Dr. Whitman controlled the policy of President Tyler's administration in any way.'"

Had Dr. Mowry cared to quote original and strictly con-

temporaneous sources on President Tyler's administration, he could easily have found in that same Vol. 2, of "Letters and Times of the Tylers," on pages 447, 448 and 449, over the signature of President John Tyler himself, in three letters to his son Robert, the conclusive evidence that as late as December, 1845, and January, 1846 (i. e., more than two and a half years after Whitman's visit to the States), neither Whitman nor anyone else had changed Tyler's ideas as to the best policy to pursue on the Oregon and California acquisition problem, and that precisely what his correspondence shows that he hoped to accomplish in 1842-3, he still, in 1845-6, thought should be attempted by President Polk. The first letter is dated December 11, 1845, and after commenting on President Polk's discussion of the Oregon question in his first annual message, continues, "I looked exclusively to an adjustment by the 49th parallel, and never dreamed for a moment of surrendering the free navigation of the Columbia. . . . I never dreamed of ceding this country, unless for the greater equivalent of California, which I fancied Great Britain might be able to obtain for us through her influence with Mexico; and this was but a dream of policy which was never embodied. I confess that throughout the whole of this business I have been firmly impressed with the belief that our true policy was to let things take their natural course, under an improved treaty of joint policy."

The second was dated December 23, 1845, and again discussing the Oregon question and Polk's message thereon, he wrote, "I think it would be a high stroke of policy to interest Great Britain in our negotiation with Mexico, so as to lead her to concede California, and thus to bring about a tripartite treaty, according to Great Britain the line she offers" (i. e., 49 degrees to the most northeasterly branch of the Columbia, and thence the river to the Pacific), "and we take California, Great Britain to pay so much towards our purchase. It would require great skill to bring this about."

If it would have required "great skill" for Polk, fresh from a triumphant election by the people, and with a good working majority in both Houses of Congress eager to support him, to carry out this "dream of policy," the reader can see how utterly impossible it would have been for Tyler, hated by the Whig leaders, and distrusted by the most influential Democrats, and only half supported part of the time by discordant factions of both parties, to ever have "embodied" his "dream of policy" about Oregon in a treaty that would have had any chance of securing two-thirds of the Senate in favor of its ratification.

The third was dated January 1, 1846, and after expressing his objections to war with Mexico and England, if it can honorably be avoided, he continues, "The United States requires

still a peace of 20 years, and then they hold in their hands the destiny of the human race. But if war does come, we shall fight on the side of right. Our claim to Oregon to the 49th degree is clear; what lies beyond is attended with colorable title on the part of Great Britain by the exploration of Frazer's river by McKenzie; but it is only colorable."

DR. MOWRY'S TREATMENT OF THE "ORIGINAL SOURCES" AS TO
WHITMAN'S TRUE RELATIONS TO THE 1843 MIGRATION.

As to (C) the only really "original sources" that it is certain Dr. Mowry has examined are:

(a) Four letters from Whitman, the first from St. Louis, May 12, 1843, the other three from Shawnee Indian Mission, May 27, 28 and 30, 1843; the first and last to Rev. D. Greene, Secretary, and the second and third to two of Whitman's brothers-in-law.

All about the migration in the first is the following: "I have made up my mind that it would not be expedient to take any families this year, except such as can go at this time."

On page 181, Dr. Mowry prints part of this letter, but carefully omits the above paragraph.

In that of May 27, i. e., five days after the migration had started from its camp, near Independence, Mo., for Oregon, all that relates to it is the following:

"I cannot tell you very much about the migration to Oregon. They appear very willing, and, I have no doubt, are generally of an enterprising character. There are over 200 men, besides women and children, as it is said. No one can well tell until we are all on the road and get together how many there are. Some have been gone a week, and others have not yet started. I hope to start to-morrow. I shall have an easy journey, as I have not much to do, having no one depending on me."

To this letter Dr. Mowry never alludes.

I have conducted sundry excursions to the Rocky Mountain and Pacific coast regions myself, but while they were gathering I did not stay ten miles away from their rendezvous, nor wait for an invitation to visit and address them, nor say—after they were fairly started—that "I could not tell very much about them," and, still less, that "I expected to have an easy journey, not having much to do, having no one depending upon me," and if there were no other letter but this—the authenticity of which is beyond dispute—it would utterly destroy the whole story that Whitman had any special influence on or concern about the originating or organizing of that migration, or felt any responsibility for its getting through to Oregon, with or without wagons.

In that of May 28 he wrote:

"I have been, as it were, waiting for three weeks. . . . I shall start to-morrow or next day. Some of the emigrants have been gone a week, and others are just going. . . . I hope to be expeditious in traveling. After we get to Ft. Hall I shall try to go on rapidly, if not before." From this Dr. Mowry (erroneously stating that it was written from St. Louis) quotes, on pages 196-7, considerably more than there is space for here, but carefully omits the last two sentences above quoted, which show that a week after the migration had started (except the few stragglers which always bring up the rear of such a great movement), Whitman intended on reaching Fort Hall (beyond which there was no danger from Indians) to leave the migration behind, though that was the only part where there was not a well-known wagon road, and where he could be of any special service to it.

In that of May 30 he wrote:

"You will be surprised to see that we are not yet started. . . . I shall start to-morrow. I regret that I could not have spent some of the time spent here in suspense with my friends in the East. I have only a lad of thirteen, my nephew, with me. I take him to have someone to stay with Mrs. W.

"I cannot give you much of an account of the emigrants until we get on the road. It is said that there are over 200 men, besides women and children."

The proper place for this was on page 197, after that of May 28, but Dr. Mowry neither prints it there, nor puts a footnote of reference to it, but on pages 262-3 he puts it in the Appendix, where few of his readers will peruse it, and fewer note its significance in relation to the claim that Whitman was prominent in originating, organizing and leading the 1843 migration.

(Cf., for the full text of the letters of May 27 and 28, *Tr. Or. Pi. Assn.*, 1891, pp. 177-9, and for those of May 12 and 30, Vol. 138, MSS. A. B. C. F. M.)

(b) The only detailed contemporaneous account of the migration of 1843 which has ever been printed, being Part 2 of George Wilkes' *History of Oregon*, published in New York in the spring of 1845.

This account covers 50 pages, or about 40,000 words, and is unquestionably the account which Burnett (*Old Pioneer*, p. 177) states that he wrote in the winter of 1843-44, "in letters to the *New York Herald*, covering about 125 pages of foolscap."

Burnett kept a "concise journal" of the whole trip from Missouri to Walla Walla, and so far as known no other journal of that trip was kept, or, if kept, preserved.

The *Herald* only printed five of these letters in its issues for December 28, 1844, January 5, 6 (two letters) and 18, 1845, breaking off without any explanation or apology, when the

migration had not crossed the south fork of the Platte and had not traveled one-fourth of the way to the settlements in Oregon. These letters were reprinted in the *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, December, 1902, with certain editorial comments, which, as far as they reflect on Wilkes' character and treatment of the Burnett account, seem to me wholly unwarranted by the facts in the case.

A careful comparison, sentence by sentence, of the Herald letters with the narrative in Wilkes covering the same part of the journey shows that every fact of the slightest importance in the Herald letters is also in the account in Wilkes, while a similar comparison of every statement of any fact of the slightest importance in the rest of the narrative in Wilkes, with contemporaneous letters, and with parts of Fremont's report covering the same facts shows the account in Wilkes to be correct on every point of the slightest consequence.

This matter is fully discussed in the chapter on "The Truth About the Discovery of Routes Practicable For and the Development of the First Transcontinental Wagon Road as Shown by the Original Documents" in my forthcoming book on "The Acquisition of the Old Oregon Territory and the Long Suppressed Evidence About Marcus Whitman" and space will not permit farther discussion of it here.

Turning now to the account in Wilkes, we find that Burnett says (p. 67, George Wilkes), "A meeting was held in the latter part of the day" (May 18, 1843) "which resulted in appointing a committee to return to Independence, and make inquiries of Dr. Whitman, missionary, who had an establishment on the Walla Walla, respecting the practicabilities of the route."

Although this account in Wilkes does not say another word about Whitman, or about any information received from or services rendered by him till September 23, 1843 (when the migration was 31 miles west of Fort Boise), Dr. Mowry enlarges (p. 193) on what he imagines Whitman told this committee.

(Page 85, George Wilkes). Under date of September 23, 1843, after stating that they were obliged to make a most uncomfortable camp, with no water except in a puddle in the bed of a dry creek, Burnett continues: "Two miles further on would have taken us to a good encampment, with plenty of fine range and water, but the Indian pilot who had been employed for us by Dr. Whitman was ahead, and out of reach, with the foremost wagons."

There is not another mention of Whitman, directly or indirectly, in the whole narrative, till (George Wilkes, p. 89) it describes their arrival at his mission station, October 8, 1843, and their purchase from him of wheat at \$1 and potatoes at 40

cents a bushel, and no intimation in the whole narrative that Whitman had anything whatever to do in originating, organizing, or (except in the hiring of the Indian guide beyond Boise) in leading this migration anywhere from the Missouri frontier to the Columbia River. Dr. Mowry wholly ignores this on page 85, and though he quotes to the extent of more than 600 words from other parts of this account (which he three times erroneously ascribes to Wilkes, who, he says, was a member of the migration, though, in fact, he was a New York City Democratic politician and newspaper man and had nothing to do with the migration), there is not in all he quotes the least reference to Whitman, except in the extract from page 67 above.

DR. MOWRY'S DISINGENUOUS TREATMENT OF SUNDRY "WITNESSES" WHOSE ALLEGED "RECOLLECTIONS" HE HAS SUBSTITUTED FOR THE ORIGINAL SOURCES OF OREGON HISTORY.

Having seen how Dr. Mowry has juggled with the real "original sources" as to the origin and purpose of Whitman's ride, let us briefly glance at his treatment of the chief witnesses whose vague and contradictory and demonstrably false "recollections" he substitutes for the genuine "original sources."

There would never have been any Whitman Saved Oregon story without the alleged "recollections" of three men (never published till 1864-5-6), viz.: Rev. H. H. Spalding, Rev. Cushing Eells and Mr. W. H. Gray.

Two of these three signed the brief "Resolve" of September 28, 1842 (quoted on p. 13 ante), which authorized Whitman to go to the States, not on any political errand, but "to confer with the committee of the A. B. C. F. M. in regard to the interests of this mission," while the third one, W. H. Gray, though he did not sign it, (because no longer a member of the mission, having just deserted it), unquestionably knew of it, and understood perfectly well the true origin and purpose of Whitman's ride. Yet each of these three men, in their first published versions of the Whitman saved Oregon story explicitly stated that the *sole* purpose of that ride was to save Oregon to the nation, without the least hint that there was any missionary business impelling him to make the ride, and no one of them ever, to the day of his death, in any of his "statements" and newspaper articles in defense of the saving Oregon story, ever admitted knowing anything about the order of the Board discontinuing three out of the four stations of the mission, including Spalding's and Whitman's, and recalling to the States Spalding and Gray (i. e., two out of the five men connected with the mission), or about recollecting that that

order was even mentioned at the special meeting of the mission, held September 26-27, 1842, though the official record of that meeting (which they all refrain from quoting), shows that it discussed nothing but that order, and Gray's sudden (and, as Eells and Walker both declared) dishonorable desertion of the mission. Dr. Mowry, knowing that this claim that the *sole* purpose of Whitman's ride was to save Oregon is false, in all his extensive quotations from Gray, Spalding and C. Eells, carefully refrains from even mentioning that they had ever made any such claim.

Furthermore, except Spalding's signature to the resolve of September 28, 1842, Spalding and Gray wrote nothing contemporaneously (so far as has ever yet appeared) as to the origin and purpose of Whitman's ride, but when, in 1865-6, they published their version of the Saving Oregon theory of that ride, they agreed in ascribing it to a taunt at a crowded dinner table at Fort Walla Walla a few days before he started on October 3, 1842, anent the announcement that the Red River emigrants would soon arrive to settle Oregon and secure it for the Hudson's Bay Company, and to the end of their lives (Spalding died in 1874, and Gray in 1889), they both insisted that that was the true account of the origin of Whitman's ride. But it having been proved beyond any possibility of dispute that the whole Walla Walla dinner story is pure fiction, because the Red River settlers came in 1841, as stated, not only in Spalding's diary for September 10, 1841, and in E. Walker's diary for September 21, 1841, but also in Dr. Whitman's letter of November 11, 1841, in which, out of about 6,000 words in the letter, Whitman devotes the whole of thirty words to the bare announcement of their arrival (in connection with other matters of much more personal concern to himself), and to show how unimportant in his mind was their coming, puts those thirty words in a parenthesis, as follows: "(A large party of settlers as half servants to the company, were at that time" (i. e., October 4, 1841,) "at the fort," (i. e., Walla Walla), "on their way from the Red River to settle on the Cowlitz.)" Dr. Mowry, by not only not even mentioning it, but by substituting for it Rev. C. Eells' entirely different and totally contradictory account, totally repudiates Gray's and Spalding's account of the *origin* of that ride, which was the only thing about it that was a matter within their own personal experience, and concerning which, therefore, their recollections, if correct, might have had some evidential value, but he quotes extensively and endorses as correct the "recollections" of Spalding and Gray as to what took place between Whitman and Tyler and Webster. That is, totally repudiating as wholly untrue, all that Gray and Spalding constantly declared as long as

they lived was the true account of all about Whitman's ride that came within their own personal observation and experience, to wit., its *origin*, our author imposes on the credulity of his readers what these same men "recollected," from twenty-three to forty years after the event, about what they thought Whitman told them took place more than 3,000 miles away from them, and concerning which, as they have never been able to produce so much as one short sentence in any contemporary book, magazine, newspaper, government document, diary or letter, that supports their "recollections," it is certain that they knew nothing except from hearsay, or a lively imagination. But that is not the end of Dr. Mowry's offense in these quotations from Gray and Spalding, for both of them "recollected" as clearly as they did anything else of what they claimed took place in Washington, that Whitman succeeded in preventing the trading off of Oregon in the Ashburton treaty, "for a codfishery on Newfoundland." (Cf., Lecture by Rev. H. H. Spalding, quoted in Sen. Ex. Doc. 37, 41st Cong., 3d session; also W. H. Gray's *Hist. of Or.*, pp. 290, 316.) That, however, having been proved by the date of the signing of the Ashburton treaty to have been as destitute of truth as their account of the *origin* of Whitman's ride, Dr. Mowry from his quotations from Gray and Spalding carefully omits what they "recollected" about the Ashburton treaty, though as late as 1870 and 1871 they both "recollected" the Ashburton treaty as certainly as anything else either "recollected"—or imagined—about Whitman's ride.

Perrin B. Whitman, the nephew, thirteen years old, whom Dr. Whitman took back with him in 1843, on February 10, 1882, wrote a letter from Lapwai Indian Agency, Idaho, to Rev. M. Eells (which is to be found on pages 12 and 13 of Mr. Eells' pamphlet, "Marcus Whitman, M. D. Proofs of His Work in Saving Oregon to the United States and in Promoting the Immigration of 1843," Portland, Ore., 1883).

In it Perrin Whitman wrote, "I heard him" (i. e., Dr. Whitman) "say repeatedly on the journey, and after we reached his mission, Wailatpu, that he went to the States in the winter of 1842 and 1843 for the sole purpose of bringing an immigration with wagons across the plains to Oregon."

This Dr. Mowry quotes (on p. 137), but omits the word "sole." It would be interesting, if space permitted, to examine the multitude of geographical and historical errors in this book not herein touched upon.

Suffice it to say that some of them are extremely laughable and others saddening as illustrations of the old adage, "How desperate are the shifts of a confirmed theorist," but as Dr. Mowry has written all the rest of the book on the same lines as the parts herein criticized, after this examination of his

treatment of every important original source, it seems unnecessary to further notice his treatment of minor "original sources" or his numerous errors in other matters.

Dr. Mowry asserts that his "Marcus Whitman" is a "history," and that "from first to last it deals with facts," and very positively denies that it is "an embellished story."

Just how he "deals with facts" is plainly shown herein, and one cannot help wondering what sort of a book he would have produced if he had exercised his intellect in the production of an "embellished story" instead of "history."

It is said that a friend whom he did not wish to disoblige having persistently importuned President Lincoln to write a notice of a book, which he could not conscientiously commend, Lincoln at last penned the following:

"Having read Dr. Blank's book, I am free to say that, for people who like this kind of a book, this seems to me an excellent sample of the kind of a book they like."

So, for those who think the proper course for a historical writer to pursue with all "original sources" that cannot be twisted so as to support his preconceived theories, is to either ignore or deliberately suppress or misquote them, or to substitute for them the contradictory and demonstrably false "recollections" of their authors written 30 to 40 years later, Dr. Mowry's "Marcus Whitman" may be recommended as a very finely executed specimen of the kind of writing they are willing to accept as historical.

WHY HIS SEARCH (?) FOR THE TRUTH OF HIS- TORY WAS A FAILURE.

Being a Review of Rev. Myron Eells' "Reply to Professor Bourne." By Principal Wm. I. Marshall of Chicago.

(Copyright, 1903, by Wm. I. Marshall.)

All rights reserved.

To examine critically Rev. M. Eells' "Reply to Professor Bourne's 'The Legend of Marcus Whitman,'" is very difficult, because Mr. Eells' methods are so unlike those of careful historians that one accustomed to reading books whose authors summarize fairly, and quote honestly and accurately the authorities to which they refer, and never suppress all mention of authorities which they cannot twist to support their own preconceived theories, is continually bewildered in reading this "Reply," and in doubt whether what he encounters on almost every page is evidence of incapacity or dishonesty.

MR. EELLS' NATURAL LIMITATIONS.

The circumstances of Mr. Eells' life make it impossible to hold him to a very high standard of performance in many respects. Born on the extremest frontier in a log cabin, and living nearly all his life on the frontier, (mostly around Indian agencies, which are not generally believed to be places specially stimulating to careful research, accurate statements or candor in discussion), he has had little opportunity to work in any library of even moderate size, and, totally lacking scientific training, he seems entirely destitute of any comprehension of the use of scientific methods in historical research, and of what constitutes valid evidence. Naturally, also, as a son of Rev. C. Eells, one of the originators of the "Whitman Saved

Oregon" story, he has the strongest kind of personal and family interest in finding some method of making that story appear to be true.

But when all allowances have been made for these matters, and also for his apparently total lack of any sense of humor, the public had a right to demand of him either that he should not have written at all, or that he should have produced a much more creditable book than he has, since all these deficiencies cannot justify the deliberate concealment or misquotation of such authorities as are perfectly well known to the author.

HIS ONE GREAT ADVANTAGE—WHICH HE CAREFULLY REFRAINED FROM USING.

It must also be remembered that with all these deficiencies he has one qualification that should have enabled him speedily to get at the whole truth about Marcus Whitman, and that is, that as a son of Rev. C. Eells, he could have freest access to all the correspondence of Whitman and all his associates with the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, and also more easily than any one else could get access to their correspondence with relations and friends, and their journals. He makes great claims to fairness and moderation and candor and desire to have the truth appear, declaring (p. 37), "The writer has no objection to scientific history as above defined, namely, the facts written at or near the time they occurred. He has tried to obtain all such scientific history that he could for all his writings. He has searched old books, pamphlets and letters for it. He thinks highly of it, and more highly of only one thing, and that is the truth. This he places above everything," and (p. 43) "The writer believes in trying to find the truth of history, wherever it can be found."

HIS STRANGE NOTIONS OF CANDOR AND FAIRNESS SHOWN IN HIS TREATMENT OF PROFESSOR JOHN FISKE'S COMMENDATORY LETTER TO ME.

Let us see how his "Reply" compares with this alleged candor and fairness and desire to discover and state the truth "wherever found." As the "Reply" is partly aimed at my discussion of Professor Bourne's paper at the 1900 meeting of the American Historical Association, I will first examine his treatment of that discussion, as printed in Transactions American Historical Association for 1900, pages 219-236 (and here-with reprinted), of which he had a copy with my compliments. On pages 20-22 he takes up the account of my work in driving the Whitman Saved Oregon story, (and all the misrepresentations about Oregon history which are necessary postulates of that story) out of school histories, and says that it was done

"secretly," and "was a stab in the dark," and that I "was afraid to meet my opponents" (*i. e.*, the advocates of the Whitman Saved Oregon story) "in argument," and that I knew that my side "had been worsted in the discussion on the Pacific coast." Nothing farther from the truth than these statements are can be imagined. I well knew that notwithstanding the careful suppression of *all* the conclusive contemporaneous correspondence and diaries of Whitman and his associates, which were in possession of the advocates of the Whitman Saved Oregon story, and notwithstanding its opponents were heavily handicapped by their inability to obtain access, in the States of Oregon and Washington, to many of the most important government documents bearing on the case, the weight of argument was so vastly against the Saving Oregon theory of Whitman's ride that no candid and fairly well-informed historian who will sit down and read that discussion as it appeared from 1879 to 1885, in the columns of the Portland Oregonian, the Seattle Post Intelligencer and the Tacoma Ledger, and in pamphlets which were mainly reprints of the newspaper articles, will, when he has finished them, have any confidence in any version of the Saving Oregon theory of that winter's ride. But I also well knew that scarcely an echo of that discussion was heard east of the Rocky Mountains, except among the very devoted adherents of the American Board of Foreign Missions, and the Presbyterian Missionary Board, very few of whom read any of the arguments and evidence against the Saving Oregon theory, but only the specious and sophistical defence of it by Rev. Thomas Laurie, D. D., (the official historian of the American Board), in the Missionary Herald, for February and September, 1885.

MY OFFER TO W. A. MOWRY TO REST THE CASE ON THE CORRESPONDENCE OF WHITMAN AND HIS ASSOCIATES IF HE
WOULD INDUCE THE A. B. C. F. M. TO PRINT IT.

As to the charge that I was afraid to meet the advocates of the Whitman Saved Oregon story in argument, it only needs to be said that nearly six years ago I proposed to Dr. W. A. Mowry, that if he would induce the American Board to print every letter in its archives from Mr. and Mrs. Whitman, together with such other letters as I should name from the correspondence of the other members of the Oregon Mission, *viz.*: Rev. C. Eells, Rev. H. H. Spalding, Rev. Elkanah Walker, Rev. A. B. Smith, Mr. W. H. Gray and Mr. Cornelius Rogers, together with such letters as I should select from the published correspondence of the above parties, and such as I should select from the correspondence of Rev. G. H. Atkinson with the American Board, so that the world might have a chance

to judge exactly what the facts are about the founding and continuance and termination of the Whitman-Spalding-Eells Mission, and the origin and purpose of Whitman's ride, I would contribute \$500 (which would be fully one-half of the *necessary* expense of it) towards the cost of the publication, and would rest the question of the origin, purposes and results of Whitman's ride entirely on those letters and on the reports of the action of the Prudential Committee of the Board thereon as shown by its official records, and by the letters which its Secretary sent in reply to them. My only conditions were that they should print the full text of those letters, and the replies to them, and the action of the Prudential Committee on them, with correct copies of the memoranda showing the date of receipt of each letter, and that they should print and put on sale at least 2,500 copies and furnish me free of cost 250 copies. While I only stipulated for the publication of such letters as I should select, I distinctly stated that it was only because of the great volume of other letters which related merely to routine missionary business, and do not possess the least value for the purposes of the general historian, casting no light whatever on any controverted points, but I also added, that if the American Board thought the publication of this inconsequential correspondence would be of any benefit, I should not object, and if they would only furnish to the public an accurate copy of the text of the letters and records I asked them to print, I did not care how much more they printed, nor how many notes and explanations they might print in an appendix or as footnotes. To this letter I never received any reply. That offer still holds good, but there is no probability that it will ever be accepted.

MYSELF IMPOSED ON BY THE WHITMAN SAVED OREGON STORY
FROM 1877 TO 1882.

It is now more than twenty-seven years since I began the study of the acquisition of the Oregon Territory, and for five years I was imposed upon by the Saving Oregon theory of Whitman's ride, as told by Gray, and Spalding, and Rev. C. Eells. Twenty-two years ago I found that story to be fictitious, and since that have never faltered in my determination to publish the truth about it, as soon as I should find myself able to do so. Compelled to work steadily at my profession as a teacher to support my family, and caught and nearly ruined in the panic of 1893, I have not yet found myself able to publish the indisputable evidence which I have been so long and carefully collecting. Finding the Whitman Saved Oregon story, with all its astonishing perversions of the real history of the longest, most interesting, most successful and most remarkable diplomatic struggle we have ever made for territory was being

imposed upon the children of the nation through their school histories, I decided six years ago, that though I could not afford to publish a book, I could (as my daughter was my typewriter) afford to send typewritten criticisms of the amazing errors into which some of the ablest of our historians had fallen through accepting Gray, and Spalding, and C. Eells, and Barrows, and Nixon, and Mowry, and Coffin, and Craighead, and M. Eells as trustworthy authorities, instead of going to original sources, as I had done in all cases. These manuscripts have been read by some three-score historians and historical students, including Professors of History in Universities and Colleges, Teachers of History in Normal, and High, and Elementary Schools, Judges, Clergymen, Editors and Librarians, and except W. A. Mowry, every person—man or woman—who has read even one-quarter part of them has been convinced that they completely overthrow each and every form of the Whitman Saved Oregon story; and nearly all of these persons had been believers in the Whitman Saved Oregon story, and many of them had put it in their books or otherwise publicly advocated it. Dr. Mowry was not convinced, not, as Mr. Eells says, "Because he had studied both sides of the subject;" but it is because his "study of the subject" has been controlled by those unique ideas of the limits of historical investigation and publication, stated in his letter of December 9, 1898 (Cf. p. 9 ante for this), that he still asserts that "Whitman Saved Oregon." To all the professional historians, and also the compilers of school histories, to whom I sent my manuscripts, I wrote urging each to subject my statements to the most rigorous examination, to verify for themselves the fairness of any or all summaries, and the accuracy of any or all quotations, and to have the kindness to inform me if they found any erroneous statement of fact, or inaccuracy in quotation or unfairness in summarizing such documents as I could not find space to quote in full, believing that any one who points out an error I have made does me a kindness, by enabling me to be wiser hereafter than I have been heretofore. To help them to arrive at the exact facts about the arguments advanced by the advocates of the Whitman Saved Oregon story, I sent several of them for examination a copy of Rev. M. Eells' pamphlet, "Marcus Whitman, M. D., Proofs of His Work in Saving Oregon to the United States, etc." Portland, 1883, and also a copy of the "Whitman Controversy," Portland, 1885, and only regretted that I had not copies enough of both to have sent a copy of each with each set of my MSS. No one of those who read my MSS. found a single error of fact, or a single inaccurate quotation, or a single unfair summary. Among those who having heard of my MSS. asked the privilege of reading them was the late Professor John Fiske, and when through with them he wrote me a letter which the

reader will find printed verbatim in the reprint from the Transactions of the American Historical Association for 1900, herewith, pages 229-30.

Having before him in my pamphlet reprint from Transactions of the American Historical Association, 1900, this letter of Dr. Fiske, as well as letters from Dr. Edward Eggleston, Professor John B. McMaster and several other historians, endorsing the correctness of my conclusions, and well knowing that very few of his readers would ever have a chance to know anything about these letters except what he might choose to state in his "Reply," how does our candid author, seeking for the "truth of history wherever found" treat this matter? He nowhere gives his readers any intimation that anybody had changed his opinions about the Whitman Saved Oregon story as the result of my labors, nor that any historian except Professor Fiske had written any kind of a letter to me about my MSS., and, quoting from my discussion in December, 1900, of Professor Bourne's paper, seven phrases, aggregating thirty-six words, entirely disconnected from their contexts, he says (p. 7): "Was it strange that Professor Fiske wrote him, 'I think the force of your arguments would be enhanced if your style of expression were now and then a little less vehement?'" Concerning this, it only need be said that Professor Fiske's kindly criticism, not of any errors of fact or of quotation, but only of my style of expression, had no reference to anything in the pamphlet to which Mr. Eells refers, (and from which he picks out thirty-six words only, and dares not quote any sentence in which they exist), because Professor Fiske was not present to hear that discussion at Detroit, and was dead before the volume of Transactions for that year was printed, so that he never either heard or read one sentence of this to which our candid (?) author applies Professor Fiske's criticism, nor is there the least reason to suppose that Professor Fiske would have criticised my style in that discussion as too vehement, since it was entirely acceptable to the Publication Committee of the American Historical Association, without whose approval it could not have been printed in the Transactions.

I wrote Professor Fiske immediately on receipt of his letter, thanking him for his kindly criticism, but explaining to him that the MSS. sent him were not intended for publication without careful revision, but that they were criticisms, copies of which had been sent directly to the authors of the school histories criticised, and that I had made some of them extremely sarcastic, because the parties criticised had been exceedingly discourteous to me when, some years before, I had written them very courteous letters warning them (some of them before their books were published) of the wholly fictitious nature of the Whitman Saved Oregon story, and imploring

them to investigate the original sources before imposing such a fiction on the school children of the country as history, and assuring them that, if they put it in, they would speedily be obliged to cut it out, as its falsity would be proved beyond any question, and offering to put before them without charge (in confidence, for their own use only,) all the evidence in my possession, (which had cost me \$10,000 in money and time to collect,) to enable them to arrive at the truth about the matter.

On page 8 our candid author says "He" (i. e., M. Eells) "prefers to follow the advice of Professor Fiske to Professor Marshall, 'It seems to me that there is great value in a quiet form of statement, even approaching to an understatement, for it gives the reader a chance to do a little swearing at the enemy on his own account.'"

Had Mr. Eells either printed the whole of Dr. Fiske's letter, or had said, "Was it strange that in a letter heartily endorsing the correctness of Mr. Marshall's conclusions Dr. Fiske also wrote him, 'I think the force of your arguments,' etc., he might have commented as much as he pleased on these two sentences in it, and I would not have cared to waste one moment in noticing his comments. But from a letter more warmly commendatory of the value and the thoroughness of my work on the history of Oregon than I would have written myself, had Dr. Fiske told me to write anything I pleased and he would sign it, to take out these fragments of two sentences of kindly criticism, not of the correctness of my statements, but of their style, and to apply them to an article which Dr. Fiske never saw, and so convey to all the readers of this "Reply" the impression that Dr. Fiske's letter was condemnatory instead of very warmly commendatory of my work, illustrates the idea of "candor" and "fairness" which has animated not Mr. Eells alone, but every one else who has published a book advocating the Whitman Saved Oregon story; which is my only reason for this full exposition of the matter.

HIS CANDOR (?) IN THE MATTER OF REV. H. H. SPALDING'S DIARY.

Another excellent illustration of his idea of "candor" is in his treatment of the diary of Rev. H. H. Spalding. From this diary, which has been in Rev. M. Eells' possession for many years, he has only published sixty-one words (on p. 18 of his pamphlet, *Marcus Whitman, M. D.*), and those sixty-one words not till 1883, i. e., eighteen years after the Whitman Saved Oregon story was first published in full by Spalding. Having repeatedly called on the advocates of the Whitman Saved Oregon story, and particularly Rev. M. Eells, to make this diary accessible to historical students, on January 13, 1902, I

wrote to Rev. M. Eells asking him to either print that diary or turn it over, unmutilated, to the Oregon Historical Society. To that letter I received no answer, but on pages 19 and 20 of this "Reply," after quoting that request from me, he says that some years since he did "Copy by hand and turn over to Professor F. G. Young, Secretary of the Oregon Historical Society" (not that diary unmutilated, but) "all that was of public interest in this diary"—he being the only judge of what was of public interest—and that "The diary does not include the time under discussion," but covers and "Is quite full from November, 1838, to April 22, 1842," and has a page and a half covering "February 21 to March 7, 1843," and then says, "The reader can judge from this on what little evidence and knowledge the professor (i. e., myself) bases some of his statements." What I had claimed was, that "That diary must contain a good deal of matter that would be very important in the discussion of the Whitman question." Our candid author seeks first to hedge by claiming that "it does not cover the time under discussion (that is September, 1842, to October, 1843), as if it would be possible to properly discuss the Whitman question without covering the *whole time* that the Whitman-Spalding Mission existed, i. e., 1836 to 1848, but he is careful not to quote another word out of the something more than 25,000 in the diary, except the sixty-one before mentioned.

Determined to know what was in this so carefully concealed original source of Oregon history, in July, 1902, I went from Chicago to Portland, Ore., mainly to see this part of it which M. Eells claims to have turned over to the Oregon Historical Society, and if that should not seem to me a proper selection from it, to go to Mr. Eells' home and ask to see the diary itself. Finding that the Assistant Secretary and Librarian of the Oregon Historical society in Portland knew nothing of any extracts from Spalding's Diary having ever been given into the custody of the Society, I went to Skokomish, and at Mr. Eells' house examined and copied some 11,000 words from it, and found in it, exactly as I expected, a great deal of matter which is of much importance to a thorough understanding of the Whitman Saved Oregon question, but not a single word in it which furnishes the least support to any version of the Saving Oregon theory of Whitman's ride, or to any claim of great patriotism, or farsightedness, or intellectual or moral greatness in Marcus Whitman's character or achievements. As it is evident that no advocates of the Whitman Saved Oregon story will ever have any desire to publish any considerable part of this diary, any more than to publish the correspondence of the Oregon Mission with the American Board, it appears likely that the public will have to wait for several pages of it in my forthcoming book

on "The Acquisition of Oregon and the Long-Suppressed Evidence About Marcus Whitman," in which I shall try to publish some 150 to 200 pages of this evidence which has been so carefully concealed hitherto, except as my MSS. and later Professor Bourne's "Legend of Marcus Whitman" have made a little of it known.

REV. DR. EELLS' HAZY NOTIONS OF "SCIENTIFIC" AND "TRUTHFUL" HISTORY.

Pages 35 to 44 of Mr. Eells' "Reply" contain a very foggy discussion of "scientific history" *vs.* "true history," exhibiting his total lack alike of the scientific spirit and of logic and of the laws of evidence and of any sense of humor. On page 37 he triumphantly asks, "In fact, can Professor Bourne tell what contemporary writer recorded the history of Christ, all the gospels having been written many years after Christ's death?" Now, in spite of the persistent efforts for more than twenty years past of the authors and advocates of the Whitman Saved Oregon story—and especially Rev. M. Eells—to exalt it into an additional article of religious and patriotic faith by seeking to show that the evidence in support of it is as strong as, and no more contradictory than, that offered in support of the trustworthiness of the New Testament, even he must know that there is not the remotest parallelism between the two cases. Suppose now that Matthew and Mark and Luke and John had been employed by some great society during the public life of Christ, and for some years after his death, and that they had not only written several hundred letters to that society, but also several score of letters to relations and friends, the whole, with fragments of their diaries aggregating more than a million words, and that these letters to the society were now found to be in existence, all securely bound up and indexed, and also the official action of the society on these letters and the replies to them of its Corresponding Secretary, were found to be in existence, and that many of the letters to their friends, together with fragments of their diaries were also found to be in existence, and that there were also found to be in existence many contemporaneous documents of the Roman Government of undoubted authenticity, and that in all this vast mass of contemporaneous documents of the authors of the gospels not only was there not a single sentence found expressing the slightest interest in or concern about the life or crucifixion of Jesus, but also in the government documents there was conclusive evidence that Jesus was not crucified at all, how much credence does Mr. Eells suppose would be given to the gospels "written many years after the event?" And what confidence would anyone have in the ability as a historian of any clergyman (even if, as

in the case of Rev. M. Eells, he had been made a D. D. by Whitman College), who, knowing of all this vast mass of contemporaneous evidence of undoubted authenticity, should for years suppress all mention of it, and ask people to believe instead of it "the gospel narrative written many years after the event?" This is precisely the case with the Whitman Saved Oregon story. The correspondence of Whitman and his associates with the American Board and with friends and relatives, and the known fragments of their diaries prior to Whitman's starting to return to Oregon in April, 1843, aggregate fully 600,000 words, and in it all is not so much as one short sentence expressing the slightest interest in or concern about the political destiny of any part of the Oregon Territory, or giving the least support in any way to any version of a patriotic origin or purpose of Whitman's ride. Yet Mr. Eells, with all his pretensions of candor and desire to have the truth about Whitman's life made manifest, in the sixty thousand or more words of this "Reply" does not find space to quote so much as one sentence out of all this correspondence and these diaries of Whitman and his associates prior to his return to Oregon. Of letters and diaries of Whitman and his associates of dates subsequent to April, 1843, and down to the first appearance of the first vague version of the Whitman Saved Oregon story in the Sacramento Union of November 16, 1864, there exist fully 450,000 to 500,000 words more, including fully 26,000 to 28,000 words in letters to the Secretary of the American Board from Dr. Whitman himself of dates between November, 1843, and October 18, 1847.

In the contemporaneous Government documents there is, as we have already seen (pp. 23-35 ante) the most indisputable evidence that there was no danger of losing Oregon in the spring of 1843 and that Whitman did not influence the policy of Tyler's Administration.

We have already shown (pp. 20-21 ante) how the expenses of his journey and his frigid reception by the Secretary of the American Board, in Boston, combined with the steadily and rapidly increasing decadence of the Mission subjected Whitman to a great temptation to magnify the importance of his ride, so as to convince the American Board that in some way such good had resulted from it as to justify its expense, and the resulting expense in continuing the Mission, which, but for that ride, must have been destroyed in 1843, or, at latest, 1844; and we have also seen that neither Dr. Whitman nor his wife, in any letters ever written by them, made any claim that he had communicated any information to President Tyler, or Secretary Webster, or that he had had any interviews with either of them, or had received any promises of assistance from them, or from any other Government official, or that he had found

any negotiations pending about Oregon which were to be in any manner affected by anything he had done or might do, or that he had published in newspapers—much less in a pamphlet—any information about Oregon while in the East, or held any public meetings to promote migration to Oregon, and that in but one letter, that of April 1, 1847, four and one-half years after he started for the States, did he claim that anything else but missionary business induced him to make his ride.

We have also seen how Dr. Mowry copies Rev. Dr. Thomas Laurie's deceptive quotation from that letter instead of going to the letter itself, and (p. 22 ante) I have for the first time given the public a chance to read exactly what claim Whitman did make in that letter. In my forthcoming book is a chapter on "What Dr. Whitman himself claimed about his services to the Government," in which every sentence in which he makes any claim is quoted exactly as it was written, and compared with the unquestionable facts, so that the public can judge for itself as to what value to attach to his own claims, as well as to the claims made for him by Gray, Spalding, C. Eells, M. Eells, Barrows, Nixon, Craighead, Mowry, et al.

As soon as I read, in February, 1887, Rev. Dr. Laurie's garbled quotation from Whitman's letter of April 1, 1847, in the *Missionary Herald*, for September, 1885, it seemed to me so palpably dishonest, that I wrote to Dr. Laurie asking him where I could see the original letter. He replied that he presumed I could see it at the American Board rooms in Boston, where he had.

This much surprised me, for ten years before, in answer to my thrice repeated inquiry of an official of the American Board at different meetings with him, I had been assured that there were no letters in their archives which showed the purpose of Whitman's ride. I applied to the American Board for permission to examine the correspondence of the Oregon Mission, and on permission being given was amazed to find the immense amount hereinbefore mentioned.

JOINT LETTERS OF REV C. EELLS AND REV. E. WALKER, DATED OCT.
3, 1842, FOR WHICH WHITMAN DID NOT WAIT AS HE
HAD AGREED TO DO.

Within an hour I had found not only this letter of April 1, 1847, but also the 14-page letter written by C. Eells, and endorsed by E. Walker in a brief note as correct, which contained the official report of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Oregon Mission, May 16-June 8, 1842, and also the report of the Special Meeting Sept. 26-27, 1842, each report signed E. Walker, Moderator, Cushing Eells, Scribe; also E. Walker's

16-page letter to which Cushing Eells had appended a note, stating that the subjects of the letter had been frequently discussed between Mr. Walker and himself, and its general plan mutually agreed upon, and that having heard all of it read once and parts of it more than once, "I have observed nothing of importance to which I cannot give a full assent." The endorsement by each of the other's letter made these in reality joint letters. Each was begun Oct. 3, 1842, and Walker's Journal—(perfectly well known to M. Eells for at least 18 years past)—states that his letter was not finished till October 8th, and Mrs. Whitman's letter, dated Oct. 17, 1842, (published in *Trans. Or. Pi. Assn.*, 1891, p. 167) explicitly declares that the letters from Messrs. Eells and Walker had only arrived that day, when Dr. Whitman had been gone two weeks. Rev. E. Walker's letter to D. Greene, Secretary, dated Feb. 28, 1843, complains bitterly that though they had sent their letters at the time agreed upon, Dr. Whitman had left before they arrived at Wailatpu, and so had gone without the letters from them which he had agreed to wait for; and Walker's Journal, under date of Nov. 1, 1842, reads . . . "We were writing when the Indians came up with letters. We learnt that Dr. W. left on the third of October for the States, without any letters from us." Yet in face of this contemporaneous evidence, all perfectly well known to him, Rev. M. Eells, in the *Oregonian*, of Jan. 11, 1885, declared that Rev. C. Eells told him that "Their courier reached Walla Walla" seasonably, "before the 3d," while in this "Reply," p. 68, he says, "He (*i. e.*, Whitman) "left his station October 3d, when the fifth was the day he told Messrs. Walker and Eells that he would go. Letters were to be prepared and forwarded accordingly. They reached his station Oct. 5th, but he was gone. One of these letters is now in the possession of the writer. It is a long, strong plea for the continuance of the Southern stations of the Mission. Why did he leave that letter (written by the Moderator of the meeting and endorsed by its clerk), which would have been of great help to him, if his main object had been to secure the rescinding of the above mentioned order?" But not one word of this 16-page letter of E. Walker, endorsed by C. Eells, and dated October 3, but not finished till Oct. 8, 1842, does M. Eells in his search for "truth wherever found" quote for the benefit of his readers, nor does he give its date, which would be enough of itself to disprove his assertion in 1885 that it arrived at Wailatpu (165 miles from Eells' and Walker's station), on October 3, as well as his assertion in the above quoted paragraph that it reached Whitman's station on October 5th. It is also certain from Walker's letter of Feb. 28, 1843, and from his Journal of Nov. 1, 1842, and from Mrs. Whitman's letter of Oct. 17, 1842, that instead of October 5th being the

day agreed upon as C. Eells declared 35 and 41 years afterwards in his various "statements" (wholly unsupported by any contemporaneous letters or other written documents), it was a date not earlier than October 17th that was agreed upon. This letter of Oct. 3-8, 1842 (written by Walker and endorsed by Eells), and of which a duplicate was received by the Secretary of the American Board on May 3, 1843, not only contained "a long and strong plea for the continuance of the mission," but a positive statement that to carry out the order of the Board issued in February, 1842, ordering the discontinuance of the Southern branch of the Mission (i. e., three of its four stations) and recalling Spalding and Gray to the States meant the destruction of the Mission, and also a positive statement that Whitman's going to the States, instead of being discussed for part of two days (as Rev. C. Eells asserted in his 1883 affidavit), on a political mission was not even proposed by him till just as the others were about to start home (on the morning of September 28th), which was after the record of the Special Meeting had been made up and signed. This is fully confirmed by Walker's Journal, which states under date of September 28, 1842, that it was at breakfast on that morning that Dr. Whitman "let out his plan" to go to the States. But there is not the least intimation either in the official report of the meeting, or in Walker's letter endorsed by C. Eells, or in Walker's Journal, or in any subsequent letter or diary of Walker, or C. Eells, or H. H. Spalding, or W. H. Gray prior to Spalding's articles in the Pacific in October and November, 1865, and in the cases of Gray and C. Eells prior to 1866, that anything but the business of the Mission was discussed at that Special Meeting of September 26-27, 1842, while from Walker's pen not a sentence has ever been produced which furnishes the least support to any version of the story that the political destinies of Oregon were even mentioned at that Special Meeting, or that Whitman's ride had any political purpose or accomplished any political result. Having hastily discussed his going on the morning of the 28th, without again convening the Special Meeting, they passed two "Resolves," but did not put them into the record of the Special Meeting either as an Appendix, or otherwise, so that as far as appears by its report, signed by E. Walker, Moderator, and Cushing Eells, Scribe, Whitman's going to the States for any purpose was not even mentioned in the Special Meeting. One of these two "Resolutions" of September 28, 1842, approved of W. H. Gray's withdrawing from the Mission (though the last sentence but one in the official report of the Special Meeting states that they had refused to pass a similar resolution that Gray had offered on the 26th.)

The second of these resolutions (quoted verbatim on p. 13 ante) was

THE ONLY DOCUMENT THAT WHITMAN TOOK TO THE AMERICAN BOARD FROM THE THREE MEN WHO REMAINED ASSOCIATED WITH HIM IN THE MISSION.

This Resolve authorized Whitman "to visit the United States as soon as practicable to confer with the Committee of the A. B. C. F. M. in regard to the interests of this Mission," and was signed by E. Walker, Moderator, Cushing Eells, Scribe, and H. H. Spalding, while Gray unquestionably knew all about this document. Yet when, in 1865-6, Spalding, Gray and C. Eells published their varying versions of the Whitman Saved Oregon story, each of them declared that Whitman's sole purpose in making that ride was the patriotic desire to save Oregon to the United States, and never in any of their subsequent "statements" on the subject did any one of them give the least intimation that there was anything in the condition of the Mission to impel him to make that ride, nor did any one of them admit that he had ever heard of the order to discontinue the Southern branch of the Mission (i. e., Kamiah, Rev. A. B. Smith's station, who had left the Mission in 1841, though that was not known to the Committee of the A. B. C. F. M. when they issued this order in February, 1842), Lapwai, Rev. H. H. Spalding's station, and Wailatpu, Dr. Whitman's station, leaving to be continued only Tshimakain, Rev. C. Eells' and E. Walker's station, and recalling Gray and Spalding (i. e., two out of the five men remaining connected with the Mission) to the States. Though Rev. M. Eells knows all about this order, and knows that nothing but this order and Gray's desertion of the Mission are mentioned in the official report of the Special Meeting (contained in his father's 14-page letter, dated October 3, 1842, endorsed as correct by Walker) as having been discussed at that meeting, he has never in all his voluminous writings quoted the order, nor quoted one word from his father's 14-page letter of October 3, 1842, nor from Walker's 16-page letter of October 3, 1842, endorsed as correct by his father (which he admits he has in his possession (Cf. Reply p. 68), nor ever quoted the above "Resolve" of September 28, authorizing Whitman to go to the States, not to save Oregon, but to save the Mission. Duplicates of these letters were sent to the American Board *via* the Sandwich Islands, for fear that Dr. Whitman might not get through, and were received at the American Board rooms on May 3, 1843, as the endorsement of D. Greene, Secretary, on them shows.

With this exposition of the deep devotion to truth which Rev. M. Eells has displayed in suppressing every word of the correspondence of all the members of the Oregon Mission with the American Board prior to Whitman's ride, though that correspondence, submitted by me in manuscripts, has con-

vinced not only every historian that has had the opportunity to read even one-quarter part of them, but also everybody making the least pretension to being a historian—always excepting W. A. Mowry—that it demonstrates the total falsity of the whole Whitman Saved Oregon story, let us see now how he treats the only letter of Whitman's that has ever been found which claims that anything but missionary business influenced him to make that ride, for although in several other letters Whitman makes most extravagant and unwarranted claims that great good had *resulted* from the ride, and from the establishment and continuance of his Mission, there has never been found any other letter but this of April 1, 1847, in which he makes any claim that his ride had any other *purpose* than the business of the Mission. How does Rev. M. Eells, trying "To get as near the truth as possible," treat this, the only letter of Whitman's which claims that anything in addition to missionary business induced him to make that ride? He quotes from it five times (pp. 41, 66, 69, 77 and 118), but though he three times (pp. 41, 66 and 118) quotes the first sentence from Rev. Thomas Laurie's inaccurate quotation, he nowhere quotes what *Whitman* wrote about any other object in his making the ride except to lead out a migration, and nowhere from beginning to end of his book does he even intimate that the Mission would have been "broken up just then" if Whitman had not made his ride. Not only that, but, although Whitman himself positively declared in this letter that it would have been broken up just then if he had not made his ride, our "candid and truth-seeking" author (Reply p. 69) assures his readers that "His station would have been certainly continued had he waited until Spring to go."

SIX PEOPLE KNEW OF THEIR OWN KNOWLEDGE THE ORIGIN AND PURPOSE OF WHITMAN'S RIDE.

Six people knew exactly the origin and purpose of Whitman's ride, viz., Rev. C. Eells, Rev. E. Walker, Rev. H. H. Spalding, Mr. W. H. Gray, and Dr. and Mrs. Whitman and we have seen how our candid and truth-seeking author has juggled with the strictly contemporaneous letter of his father, endorsed by E. Walker (to which he never alludes, though knowing that it contains the official report of that meeting of the Mission held September 26-27, 1842, which only discussed the business of the Mission, and not the political destiny of Oregon), and the letter of Walker endorsed by his father in which there is no hint of anything but missionary business, and the "Resolve" of September 28, 1842, signed by C. Eells, E. Walker and H. H. Spalding, which authorized Whitman to go to the States

"To confer with the Committee of the A. B. C. F. M. in regard to the interests of this Mission," and with not the least intimation that he was to go for any other purpose. For these (which the few great historians who have had a chance to read them all in my MSS. agree are conclusive evidence that missionary business, and not patriotism, impelled him to make his ride), our author substitutes his father's alleged "recollections" from 1866 to 1882, though those "recollections" are not only wholly unsupported by a single sentence of contemporaneous written or printed evidence, but on all points on which we can compare them with contemporaneous written documents are proved beyond any doubt to be wholly incorrect. Let us see how our truth-seeking author treats the evidence of the others.

THE SPALDING-GRAY VERSION OF THE ORIGIN OF WHITMAN'S
RIDE TOTALLY REPUDIATED BY REV. M. EELLS.

We have already seen (pp. 40-42 ante) that Dr. Mowry, while using a great amount of what Gray and Spalding after 1864-66 "recollected"—or imagined—about Whitman's ride, and endorsing them as good, truthful men whose "recollections" may safely be depended upon as to the place Whitman should occupy in the history of Oregon, himself totally rejects *all* that they wrote about Whitman's ride, which was a matter of their own personal knowledge and experience, to-wit., its origin, by not even alluding to the Spalding-Gray version of the great dinner at Walla Walla, and the taunt anent the announcement of the speedy arrival of the Red River settlers, etc., nor to their "recollection" that to save Oregon was the "sole purpose" of his ride, nor to their equally positive "recollection" that Whitman barely succeeded in preventing the trading off of Oregon in the Ashburton treaty for a codfishery on the banks of Newfoundland.

Rev. M. Eells in like manner calmly repudiates all of these "recollections" of Gray and Spalding, (since they have been proved beyond any dispute to be totally false,) but still, like Dr. Mowry, quotes extensively from them to support other parts of the Saving Oregon story, and, carefully suppressing their contemporary letters and diaries, with those of his father and Rev. E. Walker, which demonstrate beyond any doubt the falsity of the whole Whitman Saved Oregon story, he imposes upon the credulity of his readers as trustworthy history what Gray and Spalding "recollected" about what Whitman said and did in Missouri and in Washington, from 2,000 to 3,000 miles away from them!

MR. EELLS' TREATMENT OF THE FIVE LETTERS OF MRS WHITMAN,
WHICH STATE THAT HIS RIDE WAS ON THE BUSINESS
OF THE MISSION.

We have seen (on pp. 16-18 ante) that Mrs. Whitman on September 29 and 30, 1842, wrote two letters in which she explicitly declared that her husband was going to make his ride on the business of the Mission, and on March 11, April 14 and May 18, 1843, wrote three more letters, in each of which it was necessarily implied that his ride was on the business of the Mission, and we have seen how Dr. Mowry juggles with these, the only letters in which she ever wrote anything concerning the purpose of his ride. Rev. M. Eells knows perfectly well about all these letters.

How does our candid author "seeking for the truth of history wherever found" treat these letters? He does not quote a word from them, nor in any way refer to them in such a way that his readers can learn anything about where to look for them, or obtain any other information of their contents than is contained in the following (Reply, p. 35), "He" (*i. e.*, Prof. Bourne) can find from her letters that before the Doctor started East he intended to go to Washington."

MR. EELLS' TREATMENT OF THE FIRST TWO ACCOUNTS EVER
PRINTED OF THE ORIGIN AND PURPOSE OF WHITMAN'S RIDE
IN THE MISSIONARY HERALD, SEPTEMBER, 1843,
AND JULY, 1848.

The only remaining "original sources" or contemporaneous accounts of the origin and purpose of Whitman's ride are the two official accounts in the *Missionary Herald*, and (on pp. 18-20 ante) they have been quoted and the failure of Dr. Mowry and every other advocate of the Saving Oregon story to quote them has been stated.

How does our "candid" author, in his earnest search for "the truth of history wherever found" deal with these strictly contemporaneous accounts of the origin and purpose of Whitman's ride, and the only accounts of that origin and purpose ever printed till the Saving Oregon theory of it was published in 1864-66, remembering that both these accounts distinctly declare that the ride was on the business of the Mission? To the second account he does not allude in this "Reply," nor in any of the numerous articles he has written in defense of the Whitman Legend, and from the first he only quotes two words, as follows: (Reply, p. 41), (writing of the Special Meeting which authorized Whitman's ride). "In *Miss. Herald* for September, 1843, it was stated by the editor that such a meeting

was held, but he said that it was 'last October.' This was scientific, but it was not the truth."

Our truth seeking author quotes nothing more of this, the first account ever printed as to the origin and purpose of Whitman's ride, from title page to finis of this "Reply," except this quibble over the petty mistake of the editor in writing "last October," when, as a fact, the meeting was held September 26 and 27. Mr. Eells' statement that this trivial error "was scientific" is nonsense. Scientific history, according to his own inaccurate definition of it (Reply, p. 37), is "The facts written at or near the time they occurred," and "last October" was *not* "a fact," but a blunder of the editor of the *Missionary Herald*, doubtless due to the fact that both C. Eells' letter and E. Walker's letter were dated October 3, 1842. But C. Eells' was the "Scribe" of that meeting and his letter begins its official record as follows: "A Special Meeting of the Oregon Mission was called on the 26th of September, 1843." It is plain, therefore, that the editor of the *Missionary Herald* did not refer to that official record for the date, but assumed that because the two letters were dated October 3, 1842, that the meeting was held "last October." Scientific history is history honestly, carefully and accurately written by candid and competent persons, from the very best authorities obtainable, which means, always from the original sources when they exist and are accessible. As the official record of that meeting, stating that it was called to order September 26, and closed September 27, 1842, was in the office of the Secretary of the American Board, it was *not* "scientific" for him, instead of referring to it and giving the correct date, to write "last October." On p. 42 we have another illustration of the muddled condition of Mr. Eells' mind on this question of scientific history. He states that a pamphlet about Mason County, Washington, was published in July, 1901, for distribution at the Buffalo Pan American exposition, "which hence would be believed to be authentic," and that it stated that Martin Koopman "conducted a restaurant at Hoodspoint," and Mr. Eells continues, "Now this is scientific because its author went there before he wrote it, took four pictures of the place for his pamphlet, and was supposed to know. But the truth is that Mr. Koopman does not and never has kept a restaurant there, but a saloon." That is, according to Mr. Eells' ideas of scientific history, every man who dashes off an advertising pamphlet for gratuitous distribution, no matter how careless, or dishonest, or indifferent to truth he may be, is a writer of "scientific history," if, perchance, he has visited the locality of which he writes, and taken some pictures of it!

THE POSITION OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT ON THE OREGON BOUNDARY.

Let us turn now to official documents showing the position of our Government as to Oregon. In 1826, eight years before any missionary went to Oregon, and ten years before Whitman established his Mission there, President J. Q. Adams instructed Henry Clay, Secretary of State, to direct Gallatin, our Minister at London, to notify the British Government that "49 degrees was our ultimatum for the northern boundary of Oregon," and with slight variations in phraseology these instructions were sent in three letters, dated June 19, June 23, and August 9, 1826, and that of June 23 is sufficient of itself to wipe away all the ridiculous assertions made about our Government having been misled by English misrepresentation about the worthlessness of Oregon. It read as follows: "Mr. Crook's information adds but little to what was previously possessed. If the land on the Northwest Coast, between the mouth of the Columbia River and the parallel of 49 degrees be bad, and therefore we should lose but little in relinquishing it, the same consideration will apply to the British. The President cannot consent to vary the line proposed in your instructions." (Cf. for these three letters, Clay to Gallatin *Am. State Papers For. Relations*, Vol. VI., Doc. 458.) No Administration ever proposed to recede from this "ultimatum" of 49 degrees, and in 1838, the Senate by unanimous resolution requested the War Department to prepare a map of Oregon, which was accordingly done by the Topographical Bureau of the War Department.

THE "OFFICIAL ULTIMATUM MAP."

This map represented 49 degrees to the Pacific as the northern boundary of Oregon, and out in the Pacific Ocean, where no rivers or mountain ranges would obscure the printing or divert attention from it, appeared, in plain type, the following: "The prolongation of the 49th parallel from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific has been assumed as the northern boundary of the United States possessions on the Northwest Coast, in consequence of the following extract from the Hon. H. Clay's letter to Mr. Gallatin, dated June 19, 1826 (See Doc. 199, 29th Cong., 1st Sess., H. of R.): 'You are authorized to propose the annulment of the third article of the Convention of 1818, and the extension of the line on the parallel of 49 degrees from the Eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, where it now terminates to the Pacific Ocean, as the permanent boundary between the two powers in that quarter. This is our ultimatum and you may so announce it.'" This "Ultimatum Map" was used in the report of the Com. on Oregon, of which Senator

Linn was Chairman, June 6, 1838, also in Cushing's report to the H. of R. January 4, and his supplemental report February 16, 1839, also in the report of the Mil. Com. of the H. of R., commonly known as Pendleton's first report May 27, 1842, also in the second report of that Mil. Com., commonly known as Pendleton's 2nd report January 4, 1843. All these reports were unanimous on the part of the committee, and all were unanimously adopted by the body to which they were made, and of them "in addition to the usual number" 10,000 copies of Cushing's, and 5,000 of each of Pendleton's were printed for distribution, so that including "the usual number" of each, there were 26,000 or more copies of this official "Ultimatum Map" printed by direct votes of the Senate and the House between June 6, 1838, and January 4, 1843. How was it possible for our government more emphatically to notify all the world of its inflexible determination to insist on 49 degrees to the coast as the northern boundary of Oregon? Neither M. Eells nor any other advocate of the Saving Oregon theory of Whitman's ride has ever even alluded to these "ultimatum" instructions to Gallatin, nor to this "Ultimatum Map."

REV. M. EELLS' TREATMENT OF LIEUT. WILKES' EXPLORATIONS.

We have already learned (pp. 29-32 ante) of the extent and thoroughness of Lieut. Chas. Wilkes' exploration of the Oregon territory, by land and water, "with a sloop of war, a brig of war, two launches, ten boats and upwards of 300 men" from April 28 to October 10, 1841, and of his very enthusiastic "Special Rept." on the Oregon territory, filed in the Navy Department, at Washington, June 13, 1842, and of the ingenious way in which Dr. Mowry, by cribbing a page of my inferences as to why the Administration in 1843 was not willing to have the whole of that "Special Rept." printed, but without quoting a word from that report, or giving his readers any information as to when it was filed in the Navy Department, or anything else which would inform them as to its immense significance in promoting migration to Oregon, and furnishing the government full and fresh information in everything of the least importance relating to Oregon affairs fully nine months before Whitman could have reached Washington, has avoided giving his readers any knowledge which would enable them to judge of the extent, the value and the timeliness of Wilkes' work in exploring and reporting on Oregon.

Skilful as Dr. Mowry has proved himself in concealing the truth about this important matter, he is thrown completely in the shade by the "candid and truth-seeking" Dr. Eells, who, from title page to finis of his reply (as well as in his pamphlet

Marcus Whitman, M. D., Portland, Or., 1883.), does not inform his readers that Wilkes ever saw Oregon at all, but only says of him (Reply, p. 86): "Commodore Wilkes, in 1841, had praised the harbor of San Francisco as 'one of the finest, if not the very best, harbor in the world!'"

REV. M. EELLS' TREATMENT OF THE ACTIONS OF TYLER'S ADMINISTRATION RELATING TO OREGON.

With equal ingenuity he suppresses all the abundant and indisputable contemporaneous documentary evidence that Tyler's Administration was inflexibly determined to accept of no line south of 49 degrees for the northern boundary of Oregon, and that neither Whitman nor anyone else, in March, or April, 1843, or at any other time during Tyler's term as President, had influenced him to any change of the policy he had about Oregon prior to March, 1843.

We have heretofore stated (p. 28 ante) that President Tyler's two first annual messages, December, 1841, and December 1842, contained strong paragraphs on Oregon and that Dr. Mowry does not even allude to them. The same is true of Rev. M. Eells.

We have also (pp. 28-29 ante) learned about Dr. Elijah White's connection with Oregon affairs, and the suppression by Dr. Mowry of everything about Dr. White, except the fact that he arrived at Whitman's mission with a considerable party of settlers early in September, 1842.

How does the Rev. M. Eells, D. D., "seeking after the truth of history wherever it can be found" treat Dr. White and his work for and in Oregon?

On page 106 he devotes nearly 200 words to showing why his "witnesses" would not confound Dr. White with Dr. Whitman, but he carefully refrains everywhere in his writings in defense of the Whitman Saved Oregon Story from any mention of the following five things which would be very apt to cause people many years after the event to transfer to Dr. Whitman the deeds and words of Dr. White.

(1.) That Dr. White as well as Dr. Whitman had been a missionary to the Oregon Indians.

(2.) That in January and February, 1842, Dr. White unquestionably had interviewed President Tyler, Secretarys Webster, Upshur and Spencer, and Senators Linn and Benton.

(3.) That he had then been directed by the Tyler Administration to raise a migration to Oregon.

(4.) That he held public meetings in the spring of 1842 in various cities—Buffalo, Cincinnati, Louisville and St. Louis—to promote a migration to Oregon, and had some newspaper notice thereof.

(5.) That he organized and was elected leader of the first large overland migration, which left the Missouri frontier May 26, 1842.

THE ASHBURTON TREATY. BENTON'S OPPOSITION TO IT. WEBSTER'S POSITIVE ASSERTION OF HIS INFLEXIBLE ADHERENCE TO 49 DEGREES AS THE NORTH LINE OF OREGON, AND REV. M. EELLS' TREATMENT OF THIS MATTER.

We have already seen (pp. 32-34 ante) how carefully Dr. Mowry avoids giving his readers any information about Lord Ashburton's instructions on the Oregon boundary question, and Webster's positive denials January 18 and February 3, 1843, that he had made, entertained or meditated accepting the Columbia river, or any other line south of 49 degrees as a negotiable boundary line for the United States.

It is now more than 16 years since in a letter to Rev. Dr. Eells I called his attention to this twice-repeated denial by Webster on the floor of the Senate, through his lifelong personal and political friend, Rufus Choate, of that indispensable postulate of the Whitman Saved Oregon Story, that Webster and Tyler were indifferent as to the fate of Oregon, and ready to surrender it to England, when Whitman, an utterly unknown man reached the states, and in some mysterious way prevented it, but in all his study of the subject since that time, and all his writings on it he has never apparently found, and certainly has never intimated to his readers that they could find this "authorized" statement by Webster of his position on the Oregon boundary, in the Congressional Globe, 27 Cong., 3d Sess. (pp. 171-2) and its Appendix (pp. 222-9.)

MR. EELLS' TREATMENT OF THE GREAT DEBATE IN THE SENATE ON LINN'S BILL, IN JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, 1843.

We have already in exposing Dr. Mowry's ingenious avoidance of giving his readers any information of value about this great debate (Cf. pp. 32-35 ante) shown how vital a full knowledge of it is to any understanding of the truth or falsity of the claim that Whitman Saved Oregon, on account of (a.) the great interest the Oregon question excited, as shown by the fact that 27 out of 50 Senators took part in the discussion, including nearly all the leaders of both parties; (b.) the fact that it was stated over and over again in the discussion that the Senate was "unanimously of the opinion that our title to Oregon was incontestable, at least as far north as 49 degrees;" (c.) the two explicit declarations of Webster, by his friend Choate, hereinbefore quoted, which definitely committed

Tyler's Administration to the line of 49 degrees six weeks before Whitman could have reached Washington, and (d.) the fact that an analysis of the vote and a comparison of it with the speeches shows that on February 3, 1843, not merely a bare majority, but certainly one more than two-thirds of the entire Senate were ready to enact any legislation about Oregon that we had a right to enact, without first giving the twelve months' notice which was all that was needful to abrogate the treaty of 1827.

Our "candid" author searching for "the truth of history wherever it may be found" has absolutely nothing to say about this great debate, except that on page 50 he quotes six lines from the speech of that political nonentity, McDuffie, of South Carolina, but with no intimation that it was the only such foolish speech on the Oregon question delivered at that session of Congress.

MR. EELLS QUOTES TWO FABRICATIONS ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN
UTTERED BY WEBSTER.

Yet, never having in all his writings intimated that Webster had thus himself, in 1842, in his negotiations with Ashburton, and in these two explicit statements of January 18 and February 3, 1843, committed himself and Tyler's Administration irrevocably to "no line south of 49 degrees as a negotiable boundary line for the United States," he devotes 16 pages of this "Reply" (79-95), to an attempt to show that Webster, in March or April, 1843, was ready to part with Oregon because he thought it worthless, when Whitman (who, as late as April, 1846, according to Spalding's letter, edited by Whitman, and published in Palmer's Journal, knew nothing about the only part really in dispute after 1824), arrived in Washington and prevented it. To prove this Mr. Eells quotes one palpable forgery (p. 82), in the extract from a speech which it is alleged Webster delivered on a proposition before the Senate in 1844, for a mail route from Independence, Mo., to the mouth of the Columbia, beginning, "What do you want of that vast and worthless area?" The internal evidence that Webster never wrote this is irresistible, for, whatever were Webster's failings, he always uttered sensible and dignified English in discussing important public affairs, and the final sentence of this extract as quoted by Gunsaulus in his Introduction to Nixon's "How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon," is, "Mr. President, I will never vote one cent from the public treasury to place the Pacific Coast one inch nearer to Boston than it is now." When I wrote to Dr. Gunsaulus and asked his authority for this he was obliged to confess that he had none. Finding it in Fields' "Our Western Archipelago," and obtaining from

Dr. Henry M. Field the admission that his only authority for it was a newspaper slip, sent him by Mr. Geo. L. Chase, an insurance man of Hartford, Conn., and being assured by Mr. Chase that he clipped it from a newspaper when traveling on the Pacific Coast, and sent it to Dr. Field, not expecting him to publish it, but merely for his opinion as to its correctness, I abandoned all further attempt to find who fabricated it. I subsequently found it used by H. H. Bancroft, in "Chronicles of the Builders," Vol. 1, pp. 518-19, but as that was not copyrighted till 1890, and as Mr. M. Eells gives as *his* authority a manuscript written by a Mrs. C. S. Pringle, in December, 1884; and as presumably she did not fabricate it, but like Mr. Chase, clipped it from some newspaper, there is no likelihood that its author will ever be known. Not only is its internal evidence sufficient to convince any one with common literary training that Webster never uttered it, but that conviction is rendered a certainty by the fact that Webster was not in the Senate from 1841 to 1845, and that no such bill was ever introduced in the Senate till March, 1846, and a careful examination of the Cong. Globe shows that upon that bill Webster did not speak at all; and by his great Faneuil Hall (Boston) speech on Oregon in November, 1845, he had irrevocably committed himself individually, and the Whig party for which he spoke, to the line of 49 degrees to the Pacific. On p. 95 he quotes that other fabrication, which has now been doing duty for 33 years, in support of the Whitman Saved Oregon story, as follows: "In confirmation of this E. D. P., in 1870, wrote that an eminent legal gentleman of Massachusetts, and a personal friend of Mr. Webster, with whom he had several times conversed on the subject, remarked to E. D. P., 'It is safe to assert that our country owes it to Dr. Whitman and his associate missionaries, that all the territory west of the Rocky Mountains and south as far as the Columbia River is not now owned by England, and held by the Hudson's Bay Company.' " This has heretofore been credited, as it was by Mr. Spalding, who first used it (Cf. p. 23, Sen. Ex. Doc. 37, 41st Cong., 3d Sess.) to the "N. Y. Independent, January, 1870." *Not January 27*, as M. Eells says in his footnote, in which also he admits that he does not know in what it appeared, but that "It was found as a scrap of a newspaper, among Mr. Spalding's papers, and is signed E. D. P. or E. D. B. or E. D. R., for the last letter is slightly torn." I have spent considerable time and a little money in searching and having searched the files of newspapers to determine, if possible, where this first appeared, but without success, though well aware that if it had appeared in all the newspapers on earth, its doubly anonymous character makes it of not the least evidential value.

TYLER'S TRIPARTITE SCHEME.

That Tyler had an utterly impracticable scheme in his mind of a tripartite treaty between the United States, Great Britain and Mexico is true, and has been well known since 1885, through Vol. 2, of "Letters and Times of the Tylers," by President L. G. Tyler of William and Mary College, Virginia (who was born in 1852), and who, like Fiske, McMaster, Scudder and others, was imposed upon by Barrows, and so gave the Whitman Saved Oregon story some endorsement, though, as he wrote to me in 1899, he had never seen any contemporaneous mention of Whitman, either in his father's papers or those of his half brother, John Tyler, Jr., private secretary to President John Tyler. On reading my Mss. he was straightaway convinced that not only he, but his half brother John, had been imposed upon by Barrows, and that it was Dr. White, and not Dr. Whitman, whom Mr. Reed saw in Washington, and whom John Tyler, Jr., thought he remembered, more than forty years afterwards, having seen at the White House. Mr. M. Eells (Reply," p. 94) admits that "Dr. Whitman without doubt never heard of the tripartite plan," but though this inchoate project was, as far as any evidence shows, the only one that any President ever even "dreamed of," as a plan, not for *yielding up* any part of Oregon south of 49 degrees, but for selling for a good round price that part north and west of the Columbia, Mr. Eells insists that in some mysterious way Whitman prevented that plan, of which he never heard. That President L. G. Tyler has for some time been fully satisfied that the Oregon policy of President John Tyler was not controlled by Whitman, and that President Tyler's three letters of December 11 and 18, 1845, and January 1, 1846, show beyond dispute that neither Whitman nor anybody else, either in the Spring of 1843, nor for more than two and one-half years thereafter, had modified in the least degree the ideas about the best policy to pursue regarding Oregon, which we know, from his other correspondence, that he held in 1842, has been already shown. (Cf. pp. 35-37 ante.)

It scarcely needs be said that M. Eells, like all the other advocates of the Whitman Saved Oregon story, has never even alluded to the above mentioned three letters of President Tyler.

DR. EELLS' UNWARRANTED ATTACK ON HON. ELWOOD EVANS.

Our candid author assails the honesty and the accuracy of the late Hon. Elwood Evans, a Pacific Coast historical writer of some note, as follows. "Reply" (p. 22) "Elwood Evans, too, properly falls under this criticism." In 1883 Dr. C. Eells had stated in regard to the meeting of the Mission held in Sep-

tember, 1842, that a record of it was made, but that "the book containing the same was in the keeping of the Whitman family. At the time of their massacre, November 29, 1847, it disappeared." The house of Dr. Eells at the Whitman Mission was burned in 1872, a fact which Mr. Evans knew. He had also been furnished with a pamphlet containing the above statement of Dr. Eells. Yet in 1884 he wrote: "In 1866 Rev. Cushing Eells had in his possession the minutes of all the missionary meetings. The assertion that those records were destroyed by fire in 1872 will not be accepted as a satisfactory excuse that between 1865 and 1872 those minutes were not appealed to to settle the question of what transpired at the Mission meeting of 1842."

It will be noticed that Mr. Evans did not say that "In 1866 Rev. Cushing Eells had in his possession the record book containing the reports of all the Mission meetings," but "the minutes" of those meetings, which is quite a different matter, as every one who has had much experience as a Secretary can testify. Furthermore, Rev. Myron Eells *himself* was the authority on whom Elwood Evans depended for those dates, for in a "History of the Congregational Association of Oregon and Washington," by Rev. Myron Eells, we read that "The proceedings of the meetings of the Missions were either burnt or destroyed at the Whitman massacre in 1847, or at the time of the fire at Rev. Cushing Eells' in 1872." This was quoted to me by Mr. Evans in a letter dated Tacoma, Wash., August 11, 1882, two and one-quarter years before the date of the article in the Oregonian, from which Rev. M. Eells makes this quotation, which he claims misquotes *his father's* statement about the records of the Mission. Reply (p. 23), he continues, "Mr. Evans wrote that Daniel Webster said in his speech March 30, 1846. 'The Government of the United States never offered any line south of 49 degrees (with the navigation of the Columbia) and it never will. It behooves all concerned to regard this as a settled point. I said as plainly as I could speak or put down words in writing, that England must not expect anything south of 49 degrees. I said so in so many words.'" The first two sentences are in that speech. Afterwards when questioned he added in regard to what he had just told the Senate, not England, in 1842, "the senator and the Senate will do me the justice to admit that I said as plainly as I could and in as short sentence as I could frame that England must not expect anything south of the 49th degree," except that there might be friendly negotiations about the navigation of the Columbia, and about certain straits, sounds and islands in the neighboring seas. Mr. Evans's quotation is a strange mixture, and the words "put down words in writing" were not then used by Webster."

As usual, Dr. Eells is incorrect in his criticism. He quotes from Webster's Works issued in 1851-2. But turning to the Cong. Globe, 1st Sess., 29th Cong., March 30, 1846, we find on page 569, 1st column, that, in replying to Senator Allen of Ohio (who had accused him of offering England the river Columbia as the boundary), Webster said precisely what Mr. Evans quoted from him, as follows: "But the gentleman from Ohio and the Senate will do me the justice to allow that I said as plainly as I could speak, or put down words in writing, that England must not expect anything south of 49 degrees. I said so in so many words." The first two sentences quoted by Evans are on p. 568 of the Globe of same date, in Webster's reply to Senator J. M. Clayton of Delaware, and are also a verbatim quotation.

REV. DR. EELLS' WHOLLY UNJUSTIFIABLE ATTACK ON BOTH MR. EVANS AND MYSELF.

"Reply" (pp. 57-8): "Prof. Marshall also says in regard to Rev. C. Eells, 'that as late as April, 1865, he denied to Hon. Elwood Evans, the historian of Oregon, any knowledge of anything but missionary business, as impelling Whitman to make that ride.' (Trans. Am. Hist. Asscn., 1900, pp. 235-6.) The writer has questioned Prof. Marshall in regard to his authority for this statement, and in his reply the Professor says that Elwood Evans wrote the same to him some seventeen years ago, and that he at or about that time printed the same statement in one of his newspaper articles. In reply the writer declares that he will not believe this statement until some better proof is given than this: for (1) the writer has every newspaper article that he ever heard of that Mr. Evans wrote on the subject, especially between 1881 and 1885, and there is not a hint of such a statement in any of these articles. Dr. Eells was then alive, and the writer does not think Mr. Evans would have dared then to have made the statement. (2) The writer will not accept Mr. Evans' statement on the subject, even if he did make it to Professor Marshall, for as has already been shown, Mr. Evans made Mr. Eells say something in regard to the destruction of the records of the meeting of September, 1842, which he did not say, and also made Mr. Webster say something he did not say. (See above, p. 23.) The writer calls for the letter, and feels sure that if his father had ever written such a letter he would have heard of it before the year 1902, and also that in newspaper articles which he has by Mr. Evans, when he fully discussed Dr. Eells' evidence, Mr. Evans would have printed this letter."

But neither Mr. Evans nor I ever claimed that Rev. Cushing Eells wrote this in a letter to either of us, which fact is

perfectly well known to Rev. M. Eells. It was in a personal interview with Mr. Evans, when he was gathering materials for his history, that Rev. C. Eells disclaimed all knowledge of any patriotic purpose for Whitman's ride, as follows: "I had seen Mr. Eells" (Rev. Cushing Eells) "in 1865. I endeavored to learn the history of those missionary years; my queries were particularly directed to the two immigrations of 1842-3; he was as reticent as if he knew nothing, surely he breathed not this patriotic claim for the little missionary convocation of 1842. True, that was in April, 1865, and Myron Eells has indicated the 'great work was not known or realized till 1866,' and possibly it was still a secret." (Cf. Art. on "Dr. Whitman and Oregon," by Evans, in *Daily Oregonian*, March 15, 1885. This article was also reprinted in *Weekly Oregonian*, March 20, 1885.) As we have seen the second reason he assigns for not believing Mr. Evans is absolutely false, for Mr. Evans neither made Rev. C. Eells say anything which he did not say about the destruction of the records of the mission, nor made Daniel Webster in the United States Senate say anything which he did not say. The first reason is equally false, for not only did Mr. Evans publish this while Rev. C. Eells was living, but published it in the most widely circulated paper published in the old Oregon Territory, four years before Rev. C. Eells died, and Rev. M. Eells not only knew about its publication, but he wrote a long answer to it—(about 9,000 words)—(which was published in the *Oregonian* of May 21, 1885), and replied, as best he could, to Mr. Evans under fifteen heads—but carefully refrained from even alluding to this, which he could not have failed to see in the article, and which, now that Mr. Evans is dead, he declares Mr. Evans would not have dared to publish while his father was living. My scrap-books, containing both articles, are now lying open before me. Furthermore, that Rev. M. Eells when he wrote this "Reply" had not forgotten about either Mr. Evans' article in *Daily Oregonian* of March 15, 1885, and *Weekly* of March 20, 1885, nor his reply to it in *Oregonian* of May 21, 1885, is certain, for in his "Reply," on pages 7, 23 and 45, he quotes from, and in a footnote refers to, the article of March 20, 1885, and on pages 7 and 18 also quotes from, and by footnote refers to, his own article of May 21, 1885, and on pages 100-103 he uses fifty lines—say, about 550 words—from his article of May 21, 1885, but without stating whence he makes the quotation.

MR. EELLS' DISINGENUOUS STATEMENT ABOUT REV. E. WALKER.

An excellent example of the curious notions about "candor" which Rev. M. Eells has acquired in his long residence about Indian agencies is found in a footnote (on p. 59), concerning

the reason why no evidence has ever been produced from Rev. E. Walker giving the least support to any form of the Whitman Saved Oregon story, as follows: "Mr. Walker died in 1877, before this controversy arose. Hence his testimony was not obtained." Could anything more disingenuous be imagined than this? Eighteen seventy-seven was twelve years after the Saving Oregon story was first printed in full by Spalding, and eleven years after Rev. C. Eells published his entirely different and contradictory version of its origin, and "the controversy" was constantly on after 1865, and "it goes without saying" that the advocates of the story would have been delighted to have secured a statement endorsing either version of it from Walker, or to have used any that he left when he died, in diary or letter. But he was too thoroughly honest a man to make any statement they could use, and his diary and his letters are among the strongest documents, that in the opinion of all real historians who have read them, totally disprove the Saving Oregon theory of Whitman's ride.

NO ANTAGONISM BETWEEN THE HUDSON'S BAY COMPANY AND
THESE MISSIONARIES.

As he has repeatedly done in his newspaper articles, our "candid" author in "Reply" (pp. 96-7) assigns as the reason why the Whitman Saved Oregon story was not published earlier that the mission was dependent on the Hudson's Bay Company for supplies and that it would not have been prudent to state the real purpose of Whitman's ride, as it "might have so alienated the company that they would have cut off the supplies."

This, with much more he has written, is designed to convince the public (which is profoundly ignorant of the valid evidence on this subject) that there was antagonism between the Hudson's Bay Company and these missionaries, and the same stuff at greater length was written by Edwin Eells (a brother of Myron) to the Sunday School Times, and published in its issue of November 22, 1902.

In my forthcoming "History of the Acquisition of Oregon and the Long-Suppressed Evidence About Marcus Whitman," I shall print scores of pages of the letters and diaries of these missionaries, which will convince every reader that sorrier fictions were never printed than this stuff about antagonism between the Hudson's Bay Company and these missionaries, and that in reality the Hudson's Bay Company treated all these missionaries with the most constant and unbounded kindness during the whole existence of the mission.

But there is only space here for two items.

First. No sooner did news of the Whitman massacre reach

Ft. Vancouver than James Douglas and P. S. Ogden fitted out two boats, and with sixteen men and an ample supply of Indian goods, started them under the command of Ogden to Ft. Walla Walla, about 300 miles up the Columbia. Making utmost possible speed, they reached Walla Walla December 19, and Ogden immediately began negotiations for the ransom of the fifty-one captives at Whitman's station, and the nine at Spalding's station, who were virtually captives, since the Nez Percés would only allow them to leave on payment by Ogden of a ransom, and so vigorously did he prosecute his mission of mercy that January 1, 1848, the sixty ransomed ones were at Walla Walla, and the next day they started down the river, and in due time Mr. Ogden delivered them in safety at Oregon City.

January 8, 1848, Rev. H. H. Spalding wrote to D. Greene, secretary, a letter giving an account of the massacre and the rescue of the captives, and continued as follows "Too much praise cannot be credited to Mr. Ogden for his timely, prompt and judicious and Christian efforts in our behalf.

"We owe it under kind heaven to the efforts of Mr. Ogden and Mr. Douglas that we are alive and at this place to-day.

"May the God of Heaven abundantly reward them."

The whole history of Indian massacres since the settlement of America began shows no other instance where so many captives were so quickly rescued with no fighting and with no overwhelming military force menacing the Indians.

The Oregon Spectator, the only paper then published in Oregon, in its issue of January 20, 1848, printed the following letter:

"Oregon City, 17 Jan., 1848.

"Sir: I feel it a duty as well as a pleasure to tender you my sincere thanks and the thanks of this community for your exertions in behalf of the widows and orphans that were left in the hands of the Cayuse Indians.

"Their state was a deplorable one, subject to the caprices of savages, exposed to their insults, compelled to labor for them, and remaining constantly in dread lest they should be butchered, as their husbands and fathers had been.

"From this state I am fully satisfied we could not relieve them.

"A small party of Americans would have been looked upon by them with contempt; a large party would have been the signal for a general massacre.

"Your immediate departure from Vancouver on receipt of the intelligence from Wailatpu enabling you to arrive at Walla Walla before the news of the American party having started from this place reached them, together with your influence over the Indians, accomplished the desirable object of relieving the distressed.

"Your exertions in behalf of the prisoners will no doubt cause a feeling of pleasure to you through life, but this does not relieve them nor us from obligations we are under to you.

"You have also laid the American government under obligations to you, for their citizens were the subjects of the massacre, and their widows and orphans are the relieved ones. With a sincere prayer that the widows' God and the Father of the Fatherless may reward you for your kindness, I have the honor to remain, sir, Your obedient servant,

"GEORGE ABERNETHY,

"Governor of Oregon Territory.

"To Peter Skeen Ogden, Esq., Chief Factor Honorable Hudson's Bay Company, Vancouver."

For this expenditure of time and labor and of property paid for the ransom of these American citizens no bill was ever rendered by the Hudson's Bay Company, either to the National Government or to that of Oregon, nor was any payment ever made to the Hudson's Bay Company by either government.

Second. Rev. C. Eells and E. Walker, at their station, 165 miles north of Whitman's station, did not hear of the massacre (which began November 29, 1847) till December 9, 1847.

They straightway sent an express to Fort Colville, the nearest Hudson's Bay Company's post, sixty miles to the north, and John Lee Lewes, chief factor in charge there, immediately replied, urging them, if it should appear that they were in any danger, to "Fly to this establishment without delay, and I will do my best for your protection." March 15, 1848, the situation became so menacing at their station that they went to Colville, and from that time till June 1, both families, including Myron and Edwin, then very small children, were most hospitably entertained without charge at Fort Colville. Then a detachment from the First Oregon Rifles was sent to escort them to Walla Walla and start them down the river to the American settlements, nearly 400 miles to the southwest.

On leaving Colville, Rev. C. Eells wrote in his journal, "With emotions which we could not well express for the great kindness and invaluable assistance of John Lee Lewes, Esq., we took leave of that worthy gentleman." (Cf., letter No. 107 (22 pages foolscap, in the form of a journal), from Rev. C. Eells to D. Greene, in Vol. 248, Am. Bd. Correspondence.)

Silly as is all this talk of antagonism between the Hudson's Bay Company and the American Board missionaries, rendering it necessary to conceal the real object of Whitman's ride when written by anybody, in view of its total falsity, its silliness is thrown completely in the shade when written by the Rev. Myron Eells, D.D., or by his brother, Edwin Eells, by the shameless ingratitude of this slanderous fiction about those

to whose humanity and kindness the families of Rev. E. Walker and Cushing Eells owed their lives.

WHITMAN PROBABLY WENT FIRST TO BOSTON AND LATER TO WASHINGTON.

Our candid author "seeking for the truth of history wherever it can be found," having carefully suppressed all the contemporaneous evidence that proves the "recollections" of his witnesses to be wholly incorrect as to the origin and purpose of Whitman's ride, calmly assumes that he went to Washington before he went to Boston (Cf. pp. 5, 42, 68), though no one has yet found a single sentence from the pen of either Dr. Whitman or his wife that gives the least information as to whether he went first to Boston or to Washington, nor has a single statement been found in any contemporaneous letter, book or newspaper on that point, nor in any subsequent letter, book or newspaper till the Whitman Saved Oregon story had begun to take shape, more than fifteen years after Whitman's ride.

A visit to Washington, either before or after his visit to Boston, furnishes not the least proof that he was seeking to affect the political destinies of Oregon in any way, since such a visit was merely in the direct line of his duty as a missionary to the Oregon Indians, all the Indians being at that time under the charge of the War Department, and not, as later, under the Interior Department.

Every Indian missionary, therefore, returning from any remote Indian tribe, would naturally endeavor, if possible, to see the Secretary of War (the only Cabinet officer that Whitman in his letters claims to have seen, or with whom he claims to have had any correspondence), especially if, as we know from his own letters was the case with Whitman, he had a plan to propose to that officer to get government aid for the Indians under his charge. (Cf. his letter of May 28, 1843, in Tr. O. P. Assn. 1891, pp. 178-9, as follows: "I mean to impress upon the Secretary of War that sheep are more important to Oregon's interest than soldiers. We want to get sheep and stock from government for Indians, instead of money for their lands. I have written him on the main interests of the Indian country; but I mean still to write a private letter touching some particular interests.")

There is no probability that the date of Whitman's visit to Washington can be determined with certainty, farther than that he could not possibly have been there earlier than March 12 to 15, and probably not before March 20 to 25, while it is altogether likely that he went there somewhere about April 10 or 12, after visiting Boston.

I have spent no small amount of time and money trying to

trace his journey, with the result that no trace can be found of his whereabouts between February 15, 1843, when, according to his own statement to the Prudential Committee of the American Board, as appears in their records, he reached Westport, Mo., and March 28, 1843, when he called on the editor of the New York Tribune.

Rev. M. Eells says (Reply, p 89): "He was at New York March 28, according to a letter of his now extant, which he wrote from that place to the government in regard to some claims of W. H. Gray against the government."

So general have I found Mr. Eells' inaccuracy that I now never accept any statement of his without investigation, and in this matter, after writing a half dozen letters, and finally obtaining from the Indian Bureau a copy of this letter, I found it written *not* March 28, 1843, from New York, but April 8, 1843, from Boston. It is brief and absolutely inconsequential as to any point under discussion herein, and gives no hint as to his either having been or intending to go to Washington.

With the rivers frozen as they were in that uncommonly severe winter of 1842-43, it is absolutely certain that a poor man, like Whitman, provided in advance with no relays of horses, and traveling by saddle to St. Louis, and by coach from there, even if he went first to Washington, could not have reached there till some time late in March, and, indeed, Spalding's first account, in the Pacific for October 19, 1865, said: "He reached Washington last March, 1843." But this "recollection" was promptly "amended" so as to place him there March 2, as soon as attention was called to the fact that the Twenty-seventh Congress expired by limitation March 3, 1843. (Cf. Spalding's lecture, Sen. Ex. Doc. 37, 41 Con., 3d Sess., p. 21.)

As he must have learned of the signing and of the terms of the Ashburton treaty as soon as he reached the frontier, and of the expiration of the Twenty-seventh Congress before leaving St. Louis, no occasion existed for him to hasten to Washington, even if we suppose him conceited enough (which I do not believe he was) to suppose he could affect the political destinies of Oregon by going there; nor is there the least probability, if he did seek to accomplish any political result at Washington, that he would deem it wise for him to go there till after going to Boston, and getting the decision of the American Board on the question of whether or not they would rescind their destructive order of February, 1842, and continue the Southern branch of the mission (*i. e.*, his own and Spalding's stations), whose discontinuance in the opinion of all the missionaries meant the total destruction of the mission. (Cf. Walker's letter of February 28, 1843, and Whitman's letter of

April 1, 1847.) Unless he could secure the rescission of that order, he—an utterly unknown man—could only appear before the authorities at Washington as an unsuccessful and discredited missionary, whose six years' labors among the Oregon Indians had been so unsatisfactory that his mission board had issued an order which meant the total destruction of the mission.

If, however, he could (as he did) get that order rescinded, he could go to Washington with the prestige of a missionary who had made a brave winter's ride across the continent, and secured the rescission of an unwise order of his mission board.

This statement of absolutely indisputable facts shows how potent were the reasons impelling him to go first to Boston. That this was perfectly well understood by him, and was his plan when he left Oregon, is certain from the following passages in his wife's two letters hereinbefore quoted (pp. 15-18 ante), and which, as we have seen, our candid and truth-seeking author carefully refrains from quoting.

In that of September 29, 1842, she does not allude to Washington at all, but wrote: "He wishes to reach Boston as early as possible, so as to make arrangements to return next summer if prospered. The interests of the missionary cause in this country calls him home."

September 30 she wrote: "He goes upon important business as connected with the missionary cause, the cause of Christ in this land, which I will leave for him to explain when you see him, because I have not time to enlarge. . . . He has for a companion Mr. Lovejoy, a respectable, intelligent man and a lawyer, but not a Christian, who expects to accompany him all the way to Boston, as his friends are in that region, and perhaps to Washington."

Between April 8 or 9, 1843, when Whitman left Boston, and April 20, when he left Rushville, N. Y., for his return to Oregon, there was ample time for him to go to Washington, which he could then have reached in a night and a day from Boston.

On p. 42 Dr. Eells says: "Another letter has been found at Washington which states what he tried to do there before he went to Boston." This is characteristically disingenuous, since in that letter, and its accompanying draft of a bill (published in *Tr. Or. P. A.*, 1891, pp. 69-78, and of which I have had a manuscript copy for seventeen years), there is nothing from which it can be determined whether or not he was in Washington, before or after his visit to Boston. These documents, written soon after Whitman's return to Oregon, have been repeatedly published by advocates of the Whitman Legend, as if they were of much importance, and proved that Whitman

had a great influence in the Oregon policy of the government; but it is certain that they did not in the slightest degree influence governmental action, and as they were never printed, nor the fact of their existence published till nearly forty years after Whitman's death, it is evident that they furnished no information to the public, and could not have influenced public opinion in any way.

They can be found in Nixon's "How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon" (pp. 315-332), and in Mowry's "Marcus Whitman" (pp. 274-284), and the letter only in Craighead's "Story of Marcus Whitman" (pp. 197-204).

The provisions of the proposed bill were so totally impracticable that not only was no one of them ever enacted into law, but so far as can be ascertained no one of them was ever even submitted to a committee of Congress for consideration, it appearing from the endorsement on the document that it was received at the War Department June 22, 1844, and filed, and never read again by anybody till advocates of the Whitman Saved Oregon story, in their vain search for some evidence that Whitman influenced the National policy, unearthed these two documents—interesting, it is true, as showing how unpractical and visionary were many of Whitman's plans, but furnishing not the least support to the theory that he either informed the public or influenced governmental action about Oregon.

MR. EELLS' MANY "WITNESSES."

In my forthcoming book I shall discuss in some detail quite a number of the "numerous witnesses" that Mr. Eells relies upon to prove the Whitman Saved Oregon story, but having in this review shown how he suppresses and juggles with all the vital testimony of the witnesses who *knew* of their own knowledge exactly what caused Whitman's ride, I must, for want of space, pass all the other witnesses who from twenty-five to forty years after the event (during from ten to twenty years of which they had been hearing the pleasing story that Whitman's ride was to save Oregon) thought they remembered hearing Whitman tell them the story, except two, whom I select because, first, it has been possible for me to apply to them that indispensable requisite for arriving at the truth—the cross-examination; second, they were both somewhat prominent men; third, not being connected in any way with the Oregon Mission, and never having lived in Oregon, they are generally considered to be thoroughly disinterested witnesses. and, fourth, they both furnish excellent illustrations of the danger of basing history on memory, many years after the event and unsupported by contemporaneous written records (especially when the memory is not of one's own acts, but of conversations with others),

and also of the facility with which actions and conversations are transferred in the memory even of honest and well-meaning people, from the real doers of them to the heroes of legendary tales, especially when their occupations are the same and their names much alike.

"JUDGE" JAMES OTIS OF CHICAGO.

The first is the late James Otis of Chicago (quoted in "Reply," p. 75). He first appeared as a "witness" in Rev. Dr. Thomas Laurie's article, in *Missionary Herald*, September, 1885, as follows: "If, now, Dr. Whitman could rise from his martyr grave and give us his testimony, the matter would be settled beyond dispute, and God, who, 'When his people went about from nation to nation, suffered no man to do them wrong; yea, reprov'd kings for their sakes, saying, "Touch not mine anointed ones, and do my prophets no harm,"' has most wonderfully interposed to vindicate the memory of his servant. Soon after the article appeared in the *Herald* for February, I received the following letter from Judge James Otis of Chicago: 'In the month of April, 1843, Dr. M. Whitman and myself were at the same hotel in Buffalo, N. Y., waiting for the ice to leave the harbor, so that we could take the steamboat for Cleveland, Ohio. After some four days we took the stage for Dunkirk and thence went by boat to Cleveland. He was a good talker and a man of great observation. He gave me an account of his experience among the western Indians; his trip to Washington; his interview with Webster at Washington, who, he said, listened with much interest to his statements, and then remarked: "I want the President and Cabinet to hear what you have said to me." They were called together, and Dr. Whitman spent an evening with the Cabinet, answering their questions and giving them his views as to the importance of Oregon and the steps that needed to be taken in order to secure it for this country. Our life together at the hotel and on the boat was intensely interesting. At Cleveland we were told that the boat would not sail under ten hours, so Dr. Whitman proposed that we walk up town and see something of the city. A slight snow had covered the ground, and when we reached the top of the hill the doctor saw a steeple and said: "Let us go to that church, for there is something about a church that always interests me." We reached it and walked along its southern side, where the sun had thawed the snow, and the green grass had started up fresh and beautiful. The doctor remarked: "This green grass by the side of this church is the smile of the Lord on the work to be done by its minister and members for Christ in this growing city."' I quote this last paragraph lest any should charge Judge Otis with lapse of memory. The man who so distinctly

remembers that scene at the church in Cleveland can be trusted to recall the words of Dr. Whitman about his visit to Washington."

Now, the fact is that Mr. James Otis was never a judge, nor even a lawyer, but a man of very ordinary education, who had accumulated a fortune in real estate, and had his office with his brother, L. B. Otis, who was a lawyer, and had been a judge. As the winter of 1842-3 was an uncommonly severe one, it was evident to me that navigation was not open on Lake Erie as early as March (for the real date of this incident was March, and not April, as the *Missionary Herald* prints it), and as Whitman was not given to gush, I thought as soon as I read this that it sounded much more like the garrulous, conceited Dr. White than the reticent Dr. Whitman. I therefore wrote to Mr. Otis, asking him if he had any diary or letters or other written documents by which he could determine certainly whether it was 1842 or 1843 when he met a missionary to the Oregon Indians at Buffalo, as stated in his letter to Rev. Dr. Laurie. Under date of Chicago, April 18, 1887, he replied as follows: "At the time I wrote the communication to the *Missionary Herald*, I was of the opinion that it was in March, 1843, that I met Dr. Whitman. Since then I have found some entries in a memorandum that fixes the date 1842. . . . We were together most of the month of March at Buffalo and that vicinity. The blockade of ice prevented the arrival of a steamboat to take us to Cleveland. . . . It was in January or February that the doctor was in Washington. . . . Have you any data to fix the year that Whitman left Oregon for Washington, D. C.? Forty-four years is a long time to call up events to a certainty unless one has memorandum to refer to." This letter furnishes abundant proof of the correctness of that last sentence, for, as we shall see, Mr. Otis never in his life saw or corresponded with Dr. Whitman; and instead of spending "most of the month of March," 1842, with Dr. White, whom he did meet, he could not have spent more than from March 17 to March 23, even if he started with him from Havana, N. Y. (Cf. p. 1, Medore Crawford's *Journal*). It also appears from this letter that he wrote "March" in his letter to the *Missionary Herald*, and that they changed the date to April, as *they* well knew that Whitman could not have been in Buffalo in March, and so, to have printed it as written would have furnished no "support" to the Whitman Saved Oregon story. A few months later I called on Mr. Otis in his office, and he repeated this to me and asked me where Whitman was in the spring of 1842, to which I replied that he was in Oregon continuously from the autumn of 1836 to October, 1842, and added, "you must have met at Buffalo not Dr. Marcus Whitman, but Dr. Elijah White, an ex-Methodist missionary to the Oregon

Indians, who, in 1842, went *via* Buffalo and Cleveland to St. Louis, and thence to Independence, Mo., whence he led to Oregon the first large overland migration." Mr. Otis also told me that he never had seen nor corresponded with this Oregon Indian missionary before nor after this meeting with him in the spring of 1842. Having looked the subject up pretty thoroughly, and learned that following the mild winter of 1841-2 navigation on Lake Erie opened March 7, 1842, but that (as occasionally happens) later in the month (from March 18 to 23) floating ice from the upper lakes driven by a strong wind had temporarily blocked the harbor of Buffalo against the weak wooden craft then navigating the Great Lakes, and that March 18, Dr. White and Medorem Crawford and three others arrived in Buffalo, and had precisely the experience that Otis narrates of being detained several days, and finally driving in a wagon to Cattaraugus Creek, twenty miles west of Buffalo and outside the field of floating ice, and there taking steamer for Erie and Cleveland, I wrote Mr. Otis a courteous letter, setting forth these facts, and further, that as navigation after the uncommonly severe winter of 1842-3 did not open on Lake Erie till May 6, 1843, and as Whitman wrote from St. Louis May 12, 1843, and, as the world then was he could not have gone from Buffalo to St. Louis in six days, it was certain that Whitman did not go *via* Buffalo and steamer on Lake Erie, and urging him to make public a correction of his evident error. To this letter he never replied, but, being a very self-opinionated man and an ardent supporter of the A. B. C. F. M., and like many another rich old man, unwilling to admit that he had ever made a mistake, he continued to the day of his death (September 14, 1895)—as I know from a legal friend who had an office in the Otis block—to repeat the story that in March, 1843, he met Marcus Whitman at Buffalo, and spent several days with him at a hotel there, and went on a steamer with him to Cleveland, though it is certain that it was Dr. Elijah White with whom he had this experience in March, 1842. My legal friend, who was intimately acquainted with James Otis for many years, said: "You could never find evidence enough to convince James Otis he was wrong in any position he had ever publicly taken." P. B. Whitman, Dr. Whitman's nephew, a boy of thirteen, whom he took back to Oregon in 1843, wrote me (and has written to several other people), that they left Rushville, April 20, 1843, and went to Olean on the Alleghany River, and thence by the Alleghany, and Ohio, and Mississippi Rivers to St. Louis; and while Perrin B. Whitman's "recollections" of conversations with his uncle and other people are plainly untrustworthy from his youth, his recollection of the route over which he himself went on this, the first long journey he ever made, can be relied upon, especially as it agrees with

all the other settled facts of the matter. So, in spite of the pious pæan of scriptural quotation with which Dr. Laurie introduced this "witness," it is evident that "God had *not* most wonderfully interposed to vindicate the memory of his servant," by the statement volunteered by Mr. James Otis.

DR. SILAS REED.

This "witness" also appeared first in 1885, in a long letter to L. G. Tyler, President of William and Mary College, Virginia. This letter was published in Vol. 2, "Letters and Times of the Tylers," pages 692-9. It is so long that I can only notice part of its errors. I have been unable to learn just how old Dr. Reed was when he wrote this, but he was evidently a pretty old man, and before my attention was called to it he had died, so that I could not cross-examine him personally, but only cross-examine his statement by comparing it with indisputable public documents and other printed matter to which Dr. Reed had easy access, but to which he seems not to have thought it worth while to refer for a moment to refresh and correct his memory before writing this long letter, full from beginning to end of errors. (Page 695) Dr. Reed wrote:

"I passed the winter of 1841-2 in Washington City. I had been appointed by President Tyler in the first month of his administration, April, 1841, as Surveyor General of the States of Illinois and Missouri. Shortly afterward Mr. Tyler was unfortunately persuaded by the Clay wing of the Harrison and Tyler party to call an extra session of Congress for the summer of 1841. The Clay men, while I remained at my post in St. Louis, traduced me in the Senate, and in August enforced my rejection. My pride of character would not submit to such wholesale murder by a stab in the dark. Upon the opening of the session of the Senate, in December, 1841, I called upon that body, through their Public Land Committee, to furnish me the cause of my rejection. . . . While the Public Land Committee of the Senate were acting upon my case at intervals during the winter, I took every opportunity to press upon the mind of Mr. Tyler the importance of a government expedition to explore a route across the Rocky Mountains to the mouth of the Columbia River, even if no other public benefit were gained than to make known the best line of travel for our emigrants to Oregon, who in large numbers began to pick out their way through the mountain passes into Oregon, the previous year of 1841. My noble friend, Senator Linn of Missouri, Chairman of the Committee on Territories, had about that time introduced a bill to organize Oregon into a Territory of the United States. Colonel Gilpen, afterward Governor of Colorado, returned that winter from a

private expedition down and up the Columbia River, and I had the extreme pleasure of listening to his eloquent and fascinating descriptions of that country during many interviews with Senators Linn and Breese, who were collecting material to use before the Senate in their discussion upon the merits of the bill, which almost the whole Senate treated with a smile of impatience and indifference whenever the subject was called to their attention. From Dr. Whitman, a missionary to Oregon, much useful information for emigrants and the Senators who had charge of the bill was also obtained at that time."

That Dr. Reed's recollection of what winter it was that he was in Washington is trustworthy is evident from his very great personal interest in his contest for the very important and lucrative office of Surveyor General of the two great States of Missouri and Illinois, to which, he informs us further on in the letter, the President renominated him "On the 14th of March, 1842, and on the 17th I was *unanimously* confirmed," (which we find verified by examination of the Sen. Ex. Journal for that date), but that his recollections as to the *other* matters in this quotation are wholly erroneous I shall speedily demonstrate. (1.) As to the calling of that special session of Congress—the first session of the twenty-seventh Congress—Mr. Tyler had no more to do with that call than "the Man in the Moon." Though it did not assemble till after his most untimely death, it was called, not by Mr. Tyler "shortly after" Reed's appointment in April, 1841, but on March 17, 1841, by President Harrison, a fact distinctly stated by President Tyler in his message to it, (as Dr. Reed could have ascertained by five minutes' examination of the Cong. Globe, 1st Sess., 27th Cong., 1841, p. 7, or "Messages of the Presidents, Vol. IV., p. 21). Dr. Reed's assertion, therefore, that "Mr. Tyler was unfortunately persuaded by the Clay wing of the Harrison and Tyler party to call an extra session of Congress for the summer of 1841," is without even a shadow of foundation in fact.

(2.) As to the grotesque inaccuracy of Dr. Reed's statement that "Almost the whole Senate treated Linn's bill with a smile of indifference or impatience," it is only necessary to refer the reader to the Congressional Globe, Twenty-seventh Congress, third session, for the record of the great debate on that bill in the Senate, the report of which covers 165 columns, and in which, of a total membership of fifty, twenty-seven senators took part.

(3.) As to "a large number of emigrants to Oregon in 1841." A letter of Mrs. Whitman, dated "Wielatpoo, Oregon Territory, October 1, 1841," and published in Transactions of the Oregon Pioneer Association for 1891, pages 139-145, says (p. 139): "The emigrants were twenty-four in number—two

families, with small children, from Missouri. This company was much larger when they started. About thirty went another route to California. The company of Jesuits were twelve in number."

These Catholic priests went from Fort Hall to the Flat-head country, in what is now northwest Montana, without going to Wielatpoo or Wialatpu. That is, counting those who went to California, the total overland migration to *both* Oregon and California that year, men, women and children, was sixty-six persons, and to Oregon, counting Catholic missionaries and all, only thirty-six. Surely this is not "large numbers" for a population of 15,000,000 to 17,000,000 people to send out. The first overland migration that can properly be called large was that which went in 1842, under Dr. White, which numbered 112 persons.

(4.) As to Colonel Gilpin (*not Gilpen*, as Reed spells it), Dr. Reed writes: "Colonel Gilpen, afterwards Governor of Colorado, returned that winter from a private expedition down and up the Columbia River, and I had the extreme pleasure of listening to his eloquent and fascinating descriptions of that country during many interviews with Senators Linn and Breese, who were collecting material to use before the Senate in their discussions on the merits of the bill" (i. e., the bill for the occupation Oregon, W. I. M.). Now, it should be remembered when considering these statements, that Gilpin was a very prominent man in the West for half a century after this winter of 1841-42, and a man whom Reed (who was Surveyor General of Missouri and Illinois under President Tyler, and of Wyoming under General Grant) must have met scores of times during his own long residence in official capacities west of the Mississippi, yet it is as certain as that two and two are four that all this which Reed is so positive he recollects about Gilpin in the winter of 1841-42 is totally false. Gilpin did not go to Oregon till 1843, when he accompanied Fremont's second exploring expedition, but instead of continuing with Fremont on his journey from the Dalles south along the east base of the Cascade Mountains in the late autumn of 1843 and the winter of 1843-44, and across the Sierra Nevadas into the Sacramento Valley, he remained in Oregon the winter of 1843-44, and returned to the States *via* Fort Hall, Fort Bridger and Bent's Fort in the summer and autumn of 1844.

Gilpin, therefore, was certainly never in Washington after he was "down and up the Columbia River" earlier than the winter of 1844-5 (i. e., three years later than Reed "remembers" these many interviews with him and "Senator's Linn and Breese") (Cf. on this (a) Sen. Ex. Doc. 174, 28th Cong., 2d Sess., being reports of Fremont's first and second exploring expeditions.) Page 107: "We were joined here" (i. e., at

Elm Grove, in what is now Kansas, on May 31, 1843) "by Mr. William Gilpin of Missouri, who, intending this year to visit the settlements in Oregon, had been invited to accompany us, and proved a useful and agreeable addition to the party."

Idem., page 195, describing his return to the Dalles from Ft. Vancouver, under date of November 18, 1843, Fremont writes: "Early in the afternoon we arrived again at the Dalles. . . . My friend, Mr. Gilpin, had arrived in advance of the party. . . . On the following day he continued his journey in our returning boats to Vancouver."

(b) "Chronicles of the Builders of the Commonwealth," seven volumes, H. H. Bancroft, San Francisco, 1891. Vol. 1, pages 506-66, inclusive, is a biography of William Gilpin, with portrait. In 1840-1-2, instead of traveling "down and up the Columbia River," he was residing in Missouri (p. 522). In June, 1843, he started for Oregon and joined Fremont's party. (P. 528): "On the 10th of April, 1844, he left Fort Vancouver."

(P. 529): "July 4, 1844, they were at Soda Springs (in what is now the southeastern part of Idaho) on their return to the States.

(c) Gilpin's testimony in the case of the Hudson's Bay Company and Puget's Sound Agricultural Company *vs.* the United States, covering pages 330-339 of Volume 6 of that case and given at Washington, in February, 1867, which states (p. 331): "I visited and remained several days at Fort Hall, going out to the Pacific Sea in September, 1843, and returned from the Pacific in June, 1844, remaining at this time several weeks at the Fort." (P. 332.) Int. 12: "How long and when were you at Walla Walla? Answer. In October, 1843, some eight days; in April and May, 1844, some twenty-five or thirty days." P. 333.) Int. 16: "When and how long and under what circumstances did you visit Fort Vancouver?" Answer. My recollection is that I visited Vancouver in November, 1843; in February, 1844, and April, 1844. I was there about ten days on each occasion, and on the last two occasions was specially the guest of Governor John McLoughlin, and was treated by him with the greatest hospitality and kindness."

(5.) Furthermore, as Senator Louis F. Linn died October 3, 1843, when Gilpin was with Fremont's party in the Snake River Valley, 208 miles west of Fort Hall on the way to and about 275 miles east of the Columbia, (Cf. Fremont's Rept. Sen. Ex. Doc., No. 174, p. 170), it is *absolutely certain* that not only is Dr. Reed *entirely mistaken* in saying that in the winter of 1841-42, "I had the extreme pleasure of listening to his eloquent and fascinating description of that country" (i. e., Oregon) "during many interviews with Senators Linn and Breese," but that he never during any other winter was pres-

ent at any interviews between Colonel Gilpin and Senator Linn after Gilpin visited Oregon.

(6.) "From Dr. Whitman, a missionary to Oregon, much useful information for emigrants and the Senators who had charge of the bill was also obtained at that time." All that needs to be observed as to the falsity of this is that "at that time," i. e., the winter of 1841-42, Dr. Whitman was by the traveled route more than 2,500 miles, or four to five months' journey from Washington. There can be no doubt but what the Oregon Indian missionary whom Dr. Reed saw in Washington was Dr. Elijah White, who, we know from contemporary sources, was there at that precise time, and had interviews with the President, Secretaries Webster, Upshur and Spencer, Senators Linn and Benton and other friends of Oregon.

(7.) As to Fremont's exploring expedition, I shall make no further criticism of the account which Dr. Reed gives of its origin, (which want of space forbids quoting), than to say that it squarely contradicts the account that Senator Benton gave many years ago, while Fremont, and Colonel Abert, and President Tyler were all alive, and could have corrected it, if needful, to square with what Reed thought he recollected about it in 1885, when Tyler, and Abert, and Benton were all dead, and Fremont employed in a distant part of the country where he was not likely to see Reed's letter.

(Cf. Vol. 2 of Benton's "Thirty Years' Views," published 1854-56, p. 478 *et. seq.*, for Fremont's 1st Expedition, and p. 579 for his 2d Expedition.)

But when Dr. Reed comes to speak of what it *accomplished*, he is exceedingly wide of the mark. He says, "Fremont made ready to start from St. Louis with his expedition as soon as there was green grass to subsist his animals upon, with an outfit of fifty to sixty men, after leaving Independence, Mo., and moved up the Platte River and its north branches to the old South Pass, and thence to the headwaters of the Snake (or Lewis) River, and down it and the Columbia River to Astoria, thus avoiding Mexican Territory, but kept close along its northern border after he entered Oregon Territory."

Instead of fifty to sixty men he had twenty-six men and Benton's son, a boy of twelve (Cf. Sen. Ex. Doc. 174, 28 Cong., 2d Sess., pp. 9-10), and instead of "journeying to the Columbia" on this first expedition, Fremont only went to the South Pass, and north from there to Fremont's Peak in the Wind River Mountains, and thence back to Missouri by the same route he went out on, and was never, on that first expedition, within 700 to 800 miles of the Columbia, and not within fifty to seventy-five miles of *any tributary* of the Lewis or Snake Fork of the Columbia.

On his second expedition, instead of fifty to sixty men, his party consisted of thirty-nine men (Cf. Sen. Ex. Doc. 174, 28th Cong., 2d Sess., pp. 105-6), and instead of "avoiding Mexican Territory," he, like all the other overland travelers at that time, traveled from Green River, about 125 miles *in* Mexican Territory (Cf., p. 133 of his report, Doc. 174, above mentioned), and then turned aside from the route to Oregon, and spent nearly a month more *in Mexican Territory*, examining the Great Salt Lake and the country about it, and after he reached the Columbia he did *not* "go down the Columbia River to Astoria," but only as far as Fort Vancouver, nearly 100 miles up the river from Astoria, and thence he journeyed east up the river again to the Dalles, and thence south on the east side of the Cascade and Sierra Nevadas, and then west across the Sierras to the Sacramento Valley, as Dr. Reed ought to have known, and certainly could have found in an hour's examination of Fremont's Report hereinbefore quoted.

On page 194 of the report of his second expedition, under date of November 8-9, 1843, after describing his arrival at Fort Vancouver, and his most hospitable reception by Dr. McLoughlin, the Superintendent of the Hudson's Bay Company's affairs beyond the Rocky Mountains, he says, "In the space of two days our preparations had been completed, and we were ready to set out on our return. It would have been very gratifying to have gone down to the Pacific, and, solely in the interest and the love of geography, to have seen the ocean on the western as the eastern side of the continent, so as to give a satisfactory completeness to the geographical picture which had been formed in our minds; but the rainy season had now regularly set in, and the air was filled with fogs and rain, which left no beauty in any scenery, and obstructed observations. The object of my instructions had been entirely fulfilled in having connected our reconnaissance with the surveys of Captain Wilkes."

That Reed meant Fremont's first expedition (which was in 1842) is evident from his very next sentence, which is as follows:

"The following winter, 1842-3, Dr. Whitman, the Oregon missionary, returned to the East and furnished valuable data about Oregon and the practicability of a wagon route thereto across the mountains." This sentence, taken in connection with what he has said before about Dr. Whitman having been in Washington in the winter of 1841-42, shows that he supposed, *as late as 1885*, that Dr. Whitman, having appeared before Linn and Breese (as we know Dr. White did in January and February, 1842), had gone to Oregon in the summer of 1842, and returned in the winter of 1842-43.

Now, if President Tyler, Colonel Gilpin and Senator Linn

were particular friends of Dr. Reed, and his memory played such fantastic tricks as contemporaneous official documents to which he had easy access (to wit: President Tyler's 1st message, Fremont's report, and the Cong. Globe for date of Linn's death) prove it did, concerning such well known and important public men and events, as the calling of the special session of Congress, in 1841, the extent of Fremont's explorations in 1842 and 1843, the time of Gilpin's visit to Oregon and the *absolute impossibility* of his ever having had any interviews with Linn after his visit to Oregon, of what conceivable value can that memory be about so little known an individual as Dr. Whitman, whom he does not claim ever to have seen after the time he thinks he saw him in the winter of 1841-42, but when, in fact, we know that Dr. Whitman was 2,500 miles distant from him, or, as the world then was, a good 125 to 150 days' journey, and when it is *absolutely certain* from *contemporaneous documents*, i. e., "White's Narrative" and Secretary of War Spencer's letter, and White's appointment as Indian agent, that the Oregon missionary he *really* saw at that time in Washington was Dr. Elijah White, and not Dr. Marcus Whitman?

Dr. White, ex-missionary to the Oregon Indians, very closely resembled in name and occupation Dr. Whitman, missionary to the Oregon Indians, so that Dr. Reed and, doubtless, most of the other "numerous witnesses" whose statements, made many years after the event and wholly unsupported by contemporaneous documents, Rev. Dr. Eells depends upon to sustain the Whitman Saved Oregon story, could very easily confound them and transfer White's acts to Whitman.

But there were no other men in the country with names and occupations so like those of his personal and intimate friends, President Tyler, Colonel Gilpin, Lieutenant Fremont and Senator Linn, that Reed could confound with them, yet see how egregiously he blunders about each of these prominent public men, whose acts at that time had been in print, in easily accessible books for more than forty years, when Reed wrote this letter, in which there are many other errors that I have not space to examine.

A very characteristic sample of Mr. Eells' candor is seen in his mention (Reply, pp. 111 and 116) of the first three wagons which ever went through to the Columbia, in August and September, 1840, (an account of which was printed in Trans. O. P. Assn., for 1877, p. 22). These wagons had been left at Fort Hall, not on account of any opposition of the Hudson's Bay Company to wagons going farther, but on account of the fatigue of the teams of their owners, in 1839 and 1840.

Two of them were owned by Robert Newell, and Caleb Wilkins owned the third. Newell sold one of his to Frederic Ermatinger (who was the H. B. Co.'s trader in command of

Ft. Hall in 1838, 1839, 1840 and 1841), and though with their small number and lack of tools for roadmaking they were only able to get through with the running gear, that was enough to prove beyond any question that whenever a resolute and tolerably harmonious party of 100 or more men, provided with shovels, picks and axes should try it, they could drive a train of loaded wagons through with no serious delay.

The simple fact that not only were these wagons outfitted at Fort Hall, where, according to all the advocates of the Whitman Saved Oregon story, there was determined and continuous opposition to wagons going farther, but that one of them was purchased for the journey by Ermatinger, and by him outfitted and driven through to Walla Walla, of itself, when the facts are honestly stated, reduces to senseless drivel all the scores of pages that Rev. M. Eells and the other advocates of the Whitman Saved Oregon story have ever printed about the Hudson's Bay Company's opposition to wagons going beyond Fort Hall.

It is absolutely certain that Mr. Eells knows all about these wagons, for not only does he have the Transactions of the O. P. A., but about fifteen years ago I wrote him fully about this precise thing, and in his answer he did not pretend to deny any of the facts stated in the account in Transactions of 1877.

But as the whole Whitman Saved Oregon legend crumbles to dust, if there was not constant opposition to wagons going beyond Fort Hall, Mr. Eells—knowing well that very few of his readers would ever know any more about these wagons than he might choose to tell—ingeniously avoids not only all mention of Ermatinger's part in this work, but also all mention of the fact that the wagons were outfitted at Fort Hall, and writes (on p. 111, Reply,), as follows: "He" (*i. e.*, Dr. Whitman) "knew . . . that in 1840, Dr. Robert Newell, Colonel Joseph L. Meek and two others had taken three wagons to Walla Walla," and (p. 116) describing what he is pleased to call "the victories" which Americans won over the Hudson's Bay Company and its (purely imaginary) opposition to Americans going to Oregon, and especially to wagons going beyond Fort Hall, he writes: "When four years later" (*i. e.*, than 1836) "Dr. Robert Newell and company took three wagons to Walla Walla, the enemy was again overcome," than which more preposterous nonsense was never penned—even in support of the Whitman legend.

If Rev. M. Eells and the other advocates of the Whitman Saved Oregon story would print even a small part of the correspondence and diaries of Whitman and his associates, which they have carefully suppressed for the past thirty-eight years, everybody reading it could easily "cross-examine" most of his "numerous witnesses" by comparison of their statements with

that contemporaneous evidence, with results as destructive to the value of their "testimony" as appears from my cross-examination of Mr. James Otis and Dr. Silas Reed. But as the advocates of the Whitman legend will doubtless continue their long-pursued policy of suppression, the public is not likely to have a chance to read the real evidence in the matter till my book on "The Acquisition of Oregon and the Long-Suppressed Evidence About Marcus Whitman" appears, which, I trust, will be before the end of 1904.

Rev. Dr. M. Eells asserts (Reply, p. 31) that the crediting of the first vague version of the Whitman Saved Oregon story (Cf., p. 234, *infra*.) to the Sacramento Bulletin instead of the Sacramento Union is "the only mistake made by him in this controversy" that has been found by Professor Bourne and myself.

In this he does himself altogether too much honor. It is true that it was the only one of his multitudinous errors that we specifically pointed out, because both of us were then hunting for vastly larger game than Rev. Dr. Myron Eells, to wit: for the authors of the Whitman Legend, and the historians and other writers of considerable note who had been taken in by it, and had imposed it on their readers as history.

But everything he has ever published in support of the Whitman Saved Oregon story is as full of blunders, and in every way as worthless historically as this "Reply," and surely "Language cannot further go" than that in its condemnation.

Mr. Eells (on pp. 120-22) quotes certain estimates concerning Dr. Whitman, which, he says, are "A fitting reply to Professor Marshall's statement that Dr. Whitman was not above a third or a fourth rate man." These estimates are from A. McKinlay and W. F. Tolmie, who knew Whitman, but both of whom repudiate *in toto* the Saving Oregon story, though Rev. M. Eells carefully refrains from so informing his readers; From Judge O. C. Pratt, who never was in Oregon till more than a year after Whitman's death; from ex-United States Senator James K. Kelly, who was never in Oregon till three and a half years after Whitman's death; from Hon. W. Lair Hill, who was never in Oregon till six years after Whitman's death; and from Hon. Elwood Evans, one of the earliest investigators, and, on investigation, opponents, of the Whitman Saved Oregon story, and who for some years before 1878 had been imposed upon by it. Whether he wrote this before or after he was convinced of the falsity of the Whitman Saved Oregon story does not appear, as Mr. Eells refrains from giving its date.

He also quotes from the Oregonian, but without giving the date, or the author of the sentiments quoted, and from H. H. Bancroft's "Oregon," but whether the opinion therein expressed was Bancroft's or Mrs. Victor's or that of some one

else whom he hired to compile that work, cannot be known, and he concludes with a quotation from Professor Bourne, as follows: "Marcus Whitman was a devoted and heroic missionary, who braved every hardship and imperiled his life for the cause of Christian civilization in the northwest, and finally died at his post, a sacrifice to the cause."

Concerning these, it only needs to be said that but one of them, Professor Bourne, had ever examined the correspondence of Whitman and his associates at the A. B. C. F. M. office in Boston, and Professor Bourne's examination had not then gone thoroughly enough into the correspondence *after* Whitman's ride to understand the decadence of the mission, and the un wisdom of Whitman in obstinately remaining there, against the advice of McLoughlin, McKay and McKinlay, for several years after every dictate of prudence and common sense should have caused him to at least temporarily leave, and remain away "till the hearts of the Indians should be better towards him," when he doubtless would have been invited by them to return, and might have finished his life among them in peace, and died there of old age.

When the facts are published it will be evident to all that instead of "dying at his post a sacrifice to the cause," the dreadful massacre in which not only his own life and that of his wife, but the lives of twelve others were lost, and fifty-three others, mostly women and children, subjected to the brutality of their savage captors, and from which resulted all the expenditure of life and property of the Cayuse war, was the direct result of his extreme obstinacy and un wisdom, and indisposition to follow the advice of his warm friends, McLoughlin, McKinlay and McKay, who knew the Indian character better before he thought of going missionarying to Oregon. than he himself ever did, and but for whose interposition in his behalf, the Indians would have killed him or driven him away as early as October, 1841.

Before I studied the correspondence of Whitman and his associates, in 1887 to 1897, I wrote just as strongly in commendation of him—even for two and a half years after I first publicly demonstrated in my Peabody Institute Lectures, in Baltimore, the falsity of the Whitman Saved Oregon story—as these people have done who never have read that correspondence. When the public have a chance to read that long-concealed evidence, I shall be perfectly content to abide by their decision as to the correctness of my estimate of the rank which ought to be assigned to Marcus Whitman.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

MARCUS WHITMAN:

A DISCUSSION OF PROF. BOURNE'S PAPER.

BY

WILLIAM I. MARSHALL.

(From the Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1900,
Vol. I, pages 219-236.)

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.
1901.

MARCUS WHITMAN: A DISCUSSION OF PROFESSOR BOURNE'S PAPER.¹

By Principal WILLIAM I. MARSHALL, of Chicago.

From 1877 to 1882 I supposed the "Whitman saved Oregon" story to be true, and as a lecturer, with illustrations, on Yellowstone National Park, gold mines and gold mining, California, Utah and the Mormon question, Colorado, the new West, and other subjects pertaining to the scenery, industries, and history of the Rocky Mountain and Pacific coast regions, appearing in the leading popular lecture courses from Maine to California, from 1875 to 1887, it would have been worth many thousands of dollars to me, if true, as the basis of two popular lectures on "Where rolls the Oregon," while, if not true, I saw with equal clearness that no lectures could be prepared on far-away Oregon which would pay a dollar of profit in this generation.

It was while searching for evidence that would support the story, so that it would be safe for me to risk my reputation in advocating it, that I went to Oregon in 1882 and made a pilgrimage to Whitman's grave, and learned, to my great regret, from the late M. P. Deady, long United States circuit judge in Oregon, that there was no real evidence to support it, and that the tale was, to use his own words, "merely one of old Gray's yarns." Hoping that I might save something from the ruins of it for use on the lecture platform, I continued its study till 1884, and then announced, in a lecture in the great Peabody Institute course, in Baltimore, Md., that "Whitman's ride, though a brave deed, had nothing whatever to do with saving any part of Oregon, had no political purpose nor result, but was undertaken solely on missionary

¹ Prof. E. G. Bourne's paper, read at meeting of American Historical Association, December 28, 1900, is published in the *American Historical Review*, January, 1901.

business, and if Marcus Whitman had never been born our line would have been 49 degrees to the Pacific, precisely as it is to-day."

The late Hon. George Bancroft, the historian, and the final authority on the Oregon question, did me the honor to read the manuscript of that lecture, and wrote me, September 17, 1885, as follows: "Your argument is conclusive on the question you discuss."

Having for the last sixteen years been a solitary voice on this side the Rocky Mountains crying out against this historical fabrication, it is with the greatest interest that I have listened to the very admirable paper of Professor Bourne.

As far back as 1888, foreseeing that unless its falsity was thoroughly exposed it would soon be in the school histories, I wrote to the then president of this association, offering to read a paper on it, but nothing came of it.

Had it then been taken up by the association, it would never have been in a single school history, nor in any other book having any extensive circulation, and such a totally worthless book as Barrows's "Oregon" would long since have been withdrawn from sale, instead of being pushed into every library to befog and mislead the American people about the true history of the acquisition of nearly one-twelfth of all our national domain on this continent.

Professor Bourne does not do full justice to Rev. William Barrows's special qualifications for and very peculiar methods as the historian of "Oregon." The fact is that for six years just before "throwing together" his Oregon—for it was never in any proper sense *written*—he had his office as secretary of the Massachusetts Home Missionary Society in the same building as the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions—i. e., in the one building in this whole world which contains, in the files of the Missionary Herald from 1835 to 1848, and in something like 4,000 pages of the unpublished contemporaneous letters from Dr. Whitman and his associates in the Oregon mission, the indisputable evidence that utterly annihilates every proposition that Barrows advances as to the origin and purpose of Whitman's ride, and not only did he, as Professor Bourne well says, "resist the temptation to quote one word of it," but he never intimated

in his book that a particle of evidence on the question existed there, though it seems certain that he must have known of its existence.

The notion that the title to Oregon could be in any way affected by an influx of English settlers is as purely imaginary as all the rest of the Whitman legend, since the treaties of 1818 and 1827 specifically guarded against any possibility of such a result. (Cf. (*a*) Gallatin to Clay, Sec. of State, Nov. 25, 1826, Am. State Papers, Foreign Relations, Vol. VI, p. 653; (*b*) Edward Everett to Upshur, Sec. of State, two dispatches, No. 18, date Nov. 14, 1843, and No. 19, date Dec. 2, 1843, in Berlin Arbitration, pp. 29 and 32; (*c*) Calhoun, Sec. of State, to Pakenham, Br. minister at Washington, Sept. 2, 1844; (*d*) Buchanan, Sec. of State, to Pakenham, July 12, 1845, Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 2, 29th Cong., 1st sess.; also discussions on Oregon in "Debates in Congress" and "Congressional Globe," sessions of 1824-25, 1828-29, 1838-39, 1842-43, 1843-44, 1844-45, and 1845-46, and especially at the last session two speeches of John Q. Adams, Feb. 9 and Apr. 13, 1846.)

No claim was ever made by any British plenipotentiary in all our protracted negotiations on the Oregon question that the British title had been or could be strengthened by any settlement formed subsequent to the date of the first of these treaties, viz, October 20, 1818.

Instead of ignorance and indifference about Oregon in the United States, there had been for twenty years before Whitman's ride a widespread interest in it, and about no other territorial acquisition we have ever made on this continent had there been before its accomplishment anywhere nearly so much information printed by the Government nor so many popular books and magazine articles widely circulated among the people as about Oregon before 1843.

Of these books six were immediately republished in England, viz: (1) Corporal Patrick Gass's Journal of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, 1808. (Of this also a French edition was printed in 1810.) (2) Lewis and Clark's History of the Expedition (1814), Philadelphia, 2 volumes; London (1814), 1 volume; London (1815), 3 volumes; London (1817), 3 volumes. In 1815 it was also translated into German and published in Germany, and in 1816-1818 into Dutch and published in Dordrecht (in 3 volumes), and in 1817 a two-volume edition

appeared in Dublin. (3) Irving's *Astoria* (1836). (4) Irving's *Bonneville* (1837). (5) John K. Townsend's *Narrative* (1838), and (6) Greenhow's *History of Oregon and California*, first or Government edition (1840).

Within four and a half years before Whitman reached the States Congress had printed for gratuitous circulation between 2,500,000 and 3,000,000 pages of five unanimous reports of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives on Oregon, all unanimously adopted by the Senate or House and all very eulogistic of the value of Oregon.

Its easy accessibility by wagons via the upper Missouri route and over Clark's (or Gibbon's) Pass had been printed in all the various editions of Lewis and Clark's *History of the Expedition*, and had also been declared via the South Pass route by the Rocky Mountain Fur Company and by Major Pilcher, and published far and wide by the National Government in Senate Executive Document No. 39, Twenty-first Congress, second session, January 25, 1831, five years before Whitman went to Oregon and more than two years before any missionary even thought of going there.

This document was widely copied in newspapers and magazines, and the same facts were briefly stated in four popular works on geography published between 1831 and 1835.

Two letters which Mrs. Whitman wrote while her husband was getting ready to go to the States—i. e., September 29 and September 30, 1842—the first to her brother and sister at Quincy, Ill., and the second to her parents and brothers and sisters at Angelica, N. Y. (and which were never printed till 1893), seem to have escaped Professor Bourne's eye.

They are in *Transactions Oregon Pioneer Association* for 1893, pages 165-169. The following is all there is in them as to cause of that brave winter's ride.

In the first she wrote:

MY DEAR JANE AND EDWARD: I sit down to write you, but in great haste. My beloved husband has about concluded to start next Monday to go to the United States, the dear land of our birth but I remain behind.

If you are still in Quincy, you may not see him until his return, as his business requires great haste.

He wishes to reach Boston as early as possible, so as to make arrangements to return next summer if prospered. The interests of the missionary cause in this country calls him home.

In the second she wrote:

MY BELOVED PARENTS, BROTHERS, AND SISTERS: You will be surprised if this letter reaches you to learn that the bearer is my dear husband, and that you will after a few days have the pleasure of seeing him. May you have a joyful meeting. He goes upon important business as connected with the missionary cause, the cause of Christ in this land, which I will leave for him to explain when you see him, because I have not time to enlarge.

He has but yesterday fully made up his mind to go, and he wishes to start Monday, and this is Friday. * * * He has for a companion Mr. Lovejoy, a respectable, intelligent man and a lawyer, but not a Christian, who expects to accompany him all the way to Boston, as his friends are in that region, and perhaps to Washington. * * * He goes with the advice and entire confidence of his brethren in the mission, and who value him not only as an associate, but as their physician, and feel as much as I do that they know not how to spare him; but the interest of the cause demands the sacrifice on our part, and could you know all the circumstances in the case you would see more clearly how much our hearts are identified in the salvation of the Indians and the interests of the cause generally in this country.

The Red River settlers—twenty-three families, or eighty persons in all—men, women, and children, the announcement of whose coming in October, 1842, according to the "Saving Oregon" legend, started Whitman to ride post haste to Washington to inform the Government and "Save Oregon," as a matter of fact, had been quietly settled in Oregon a year when Whitman started to ride to the States, having been at Fort Walla Walla, 25 miles from Whitman's station, October 4, 1841, and Whitman knew of it within twenty-four hours, as his own letter of November 11, 1841, states distinctly (in a part which I have not space to quote), and instead of rushing across the continent to impart the information to the Government at Washington, or even hastening to write to the Government or anybody else about it, in a two and one-half-page letter which he wrote October 22, 1841, eighteen days after he certainly knew that they had arrived, he did not write one word about them. Between the time he knew, not that they were coming, but that they had arrived, i. e., October 4, 1841, and October 3, 1842, when he started to the States, he and his wife wrote at least six letters to the States (which I have read), aggregating about 12,000 words, out of which, in a twenty-two-page letter, written November 11, 1841 (i. e., thirty-eight days after he knew they had arrived), he, in illustration of something of

vastly more consequence to himself, devoted the whole of thirty words to the bare announcement of their arrival, but without a word of comment on it, as follows:

(A large party of settlers, as half servants to the company, were at that time at the fort on their way from the Red River to settle on the Cowlitz.)

“Merely this and nothing more;” and to show how unimportant it was to him, he put these thirty words in parentheses.

Rev. H. H. Spalding's almost innumerable erroneous statements about this matter it is charitable to ascribe to a disordered mind and not to the intention of misrepresentation, although in the record of the continuous quarrel between Mr. and Mrs. Whitman and Spalding, which began before they left the States (and of which there had been certainly seven and probably eight or more reconciliations before they received, on September 15, 1842, the destructive order of the American board, dated February 25-26, 1842, which ordered the discontinuance of three of the four stations of the missions (including Whitman's), and ordered Gray and Spalding—i. e., two out of the five men then remaining associated with the mission—to return to the States, which was what caused Whitman's ride), Spalding was repeatedly charged by his associates with “duplicity.”

The prudential committee of the American board, when they made that destructive order, had before it letters aggregating more than 130 pages from W. H. Gray, Dr. Whitman, Rev. C. Eells, Rev. A. B. Smith, and Cornelius Rogers, largely filled with complaints against Spalding, and among them one from Rev. A. B. Smith, of 14 pages, dated September 28, 1840, in which, after bitter complaints about Spalding, he goes on as follows:

I would recommend that Mr. Spalding be recalled to the States and dismissed from the service of the board without bringing him to any trial respecting his conduct here. From what I have seen and know of him I greatly fear that the man will become deranged should any heavy calamity befall him. These remarks I have just read to Dr. Whitman [who, it must be remembered, was an M. D., and not a preacher], and he concurs in what I have written, and says, moreover, that Mr. Spalding has a disease in his head, which may result in derangement, especially if excited by external circumstances.

His narrow escape at the time of the Whitman massacre in 1847 supplied the sufficient exciting cause, and it is only charitable to believe him irresponsible after that time.

Most legends are not born, but simply grow, and their beginnings and authors can not be precisely determined, but

one of the very many peculiar features of the "Whitman saved Oregon" legend is that it appeared full grown, and we not only know its author, but the very date and place of its first appearance. Twenty-three years after the event the Pacific, the California organ of the Congregationalists, beginning May 25 and ending November 9, 1865, printed 11 articles, by Rev. H. H. Spalding, on the Oregon Indian missions. They were full of misstatements, which can only be pardoned on the ground of his mental condition, and in the tenth and eleventh of these articles, October 19 and November 9, 1865, appeared full grown the Whitman-saved-Oregon tale, exactly as stated in what purports to be an extract from a lecture by H. H. Spalding, on pages 20-23 of Senate Executive Document No. 37, Forty-first Congress, third session.

Not the slightest trace of it is to be found in all the hundreds of pages of the correspondence with the American board, between 1843 and 1865, of those who invented and pushed it into circulation, viz: Rev. H. H. Spalding, W. H. Gray, Rev. C. Eells, and Rev. G. H. Atkinson. They sometimes wrote of Whitman as a martyr but never as an heroic patriot.

The special temptation to fabricate it, then, is to be found in the fact that, under the treaty of July 1, 1863, for referring to a commission their claims against the United States Government (aggregating more than \$5,000,000), the Hudson Bay Company and the Puget Sound Agricultural Company had begun in the spring of 1865 to take testimony on the case (which was finally settled by an award, September 24, 1869, of \$650,000 to the two companies), and it angered Spalding to think that there was a chance of their getting a large part of that sum, while the American board had not received a cent on its extravagant claim of \$40,000 for the destruction of the missions at the time of the Whitman massacre, and were having great trouble in securing their claims to a square mile of land at each of the mission stations.

I can not agree with Professor Bourne as to Rev. C. Eells. He knew all about the quarrels which had disturbed the mission from its start. As his letter of March 1, 1842, states at the annual meeting of 1841 (when certainly the sixth, if not the seventh, reconciliation was made), he had "sat from six to eight hours, with few minutes' cessation, acting the part of a third person between the parties, and fondly hoped that a settlement was made which would be permanent, but

have since been distressed to learn that if a bar was at that time put up it has since been let down." Three months after writing this letter he was scribe of the seventh annual meeting of the mission, May 16 to June 8, 1842, when the seventh or eighth reconciliation was had, which occupied all the time of the meeting for eight days; and less than four months later he was again scribe of that special meeting, September 26 and 27, 1842, which, after two days of indecision as to what action to take on the order of the American board, discontinuing three of the four stations, finally authorized Whitman to go to the States, not on any political errand, but, as the only document he took with him from the three men who remained associated with him in the mission distinctly declared, "to confer with the committee of the A. B. C. F. M. in regard to the interest of this mission;" and when in his letter of May 28, 1866, he first indorsed the saving Oregon tale, and wrote that Whitman called that special meeting of September 26-27, 1842, to consider a long-formed purpose to go to the States to save Oregon, and that they discussed it for two days, and that "according to the understanding of the members of the mission, the single object of Dr. Whitman in attempting to cross the continent in the winter of 1842-43 was to make a desperate effort to save this country to the United States," he stated what was absolutely and unqualifiedly untrue.

Ben: Perley Poore, soon after the article appeared in the Atlantic, in reply to my letter of inquiry, wrote that he had no personal knowledge of the matter, but had depended on Spalding's and Atkinson's statements.

As to the school histories: It is now not quite two years since I decided that the most practical and valuable piece of historical work that one of my limited ability could accomplish would be to drive this story from our schoolbooks, and to keep it from gaining admission where not already in, and, as may be seen from the following letters, that task is practically accomplished with the leading ones, as soon as they can be revised, and other authors will within the next six months no doubt follow the example. McLaughlin's, Channing's, Fiske's, Eggleston's, Ellis's and Barnes's school histories have never mentioned the tale, and Dr. Eggleston, in a courteous reply to my letter calling attention to a few little errors on

other matters, and congratulating him that he had not been misled by the Whitman legend, after thanking me for my corrections, wrote:

Having been a professional student of American history from original sources for twenty years, I did not need to be warned against such a fake as the Whitman saved Oregon fable, which I am every now and then entreated to insert.

Principal W. F. Gordy wrote me early in the summer of 1899:

I am entirely satisfied of the correctness of your position, and that you are doing a great work for the truth of history. * * * The next edition of my school history will not contain the name of Marcus Whitman.

And the edition whose preface is dated September, 1899, does not.

Mrs. A. H. Burton wrote me on October 20, 1900, as follows:

I shall hereafter exercise more care in my methods from having observed the inexhaustible patience exercised by you in sifting out the truth. I have ordered the elimination of the name of Whitman from my history.

Though Prof. John Fiske had never mentioned Whitman in his books, I knew that he had in an address at Astoria, in 1892, and therefore sent him the same manuscripts as Principal Gordy, and on July 26, 1900, he wrote me as follows:

I have read the greater part of your manuscripts with care, and it seems to me that you have completely proved your case. You have entirely demolished the Whitman delusion, and by so doing have made yourself a public benefactor. I am sorry to say that I was taken in by Barrows and Gray, and supposed what they said about Whitman to be true. In 1892 I was invited to deliver the centennial oration at Astoria in commemoration of the discovery of the Columbia River. My acquaintance with the history of Oregon was then but slight. I was familiar with the history of American discovery along our northwest coast, having studied that subject in the original sources, so that part of my oration was all right; but when I came to the events of fifty years ago, having no first-hand acquaintance with the sources, I trusted to Barrows and Gray, and accordingly gave my audience a dose of Whitman. Among my audience was Judge Deady, who afterwards informed me that all that I said about Whitman was wrong. There were others who contradicted the Judge and maintained that I was right. I now see, however, that the Judge was right. I feel personally grateful to you for the light you have thrown upon the subject, and I am very glad that I never printed anything about the Whitman business. That, however, I should not have been likely to do without further examination of sources. You have done your work so thoroughly that it will not need to be done again.

I shall be very glad if you can tell me when we may hope to see your essays in print.

In conclusion, you will pardon me for saying that I think the force of your arguments would be enhanced if your style of expression were now and then a little less vehement. I quite sympathize with your feeling toward the humbug which you are exposing, but it seems to me that there is great value in a quiet form of statement, even approaching to understatement, for it gives the reader a chance to do a little swearing at the enemy on his own account.

In May last Mr. D. H. Montgomery wrote me (after reading the same manuscripts as Professor Fiske): "I am now convinced that there is no satisfactory evidence that Whitman came East on a political errand, and when I return from Europe in the autumn I shall revise my histories accordingly;" and November 13, 1900, he wrote me: "You will be pleased to know that I have this day rewritten the Whitman paragraphs in my *Leading Facts of American History* and made reference in a note to your valuable (forthcoming) book on Fremont and Whitman;" and November 16 Mr. H. E. Scudder (who it will be remembered was the editor of Barrows's "Oregon") wrote me, after only a partial examination of the criticism I had sent him, as follows: "Of one thing I am certainly convinced, that however much force is to be given to Dr. Whitman's own statement of the value he rendered, the incident of his ride had no such importance as would justify the space I have given it; nor is it the place of a school history to include matters which are in dispute, especially in such a way as to imply that there is no dispute. I shall therefore rewrite the passages in my two histories which bear upon the subject;" and on November 29, 1900, Professor McMaster, who had had the same manuscripts as Fiske and Montgomery, wrote me as follows:

I must apologize very sincerely for the long delay in returning your manuscripts and for the failure to promptly thank you for permission to examine them. Delay was caused by a desire to read every word, and with this end in view they were held till the summer vacation, when they were fully and carefully read and reread. You have undoubtedly made out your case. The weight of evidence seems to be against the belief that Whitman rode to Washington to save Oregon, and in support of your statement that his purpose was to save his mission.

The care with which you have searched far and wide for evidence is admirable, and the quantity you have gathered is surprising. Thank you very much for the use of the manuscripts and please pardon my shortcomings.

So many people like Barrows, Nixon, Craighcad, Rev. M. Eells, Rev. Dr. Thomas Laurie, Dr. W. A. Mowry, and Rev. Dr. Edwards have written upon this subject without knowing anything about the facts, that I thought one man ought to have the patience to wait till he had thoroughly mastered it before rushing into print about it, but I am now ready to publish the "final word" on the subject.

If ever the shade of any man departed to the land of spirits has had occasion to cry out, "Save my reputation from my fool friends," it is the spirit of Marcus Whitman. But for their folly in trying to make a great patriotic hero out of a commonplace man it would never have been necessary, as it is now for the vindication of the truth of history, to spread before all the world all the facts about the relations of Dr. and Mrs. Whitman and their associates, especially Spalding and Gray, the continual slanders, and backbiting, and foolish quarrels about things of no real consequence, which had disgraced and distracted the mission from its very start and threatened it with destruction when it was not yet three years old. It is without exception the most amazing story of small-souled and narrow-minded folly I have ever read, especially in view of the claims made for Whitman of greatness of mind and lofty patriotism and intense public spirit. It was these follies and not patriotism which caused Whitman's ride.

A careful examination of all the published and the unpublished correspondence of Whitman and all his associates in the Oregon Mission prior to 1843 (a matter of about 2,000 pages), shows that neither Whitman nor any of the rest of them ever wrote in it all so much as one sentence expressing the least concern about or care for the political destiny of Oregon.

After Whitman had visited the States and found the whole country aflame on the Oregon question (though not from any acts of his) he did express in some letters some interest in the matter, but not before that time.

December 7, 1857, Rev. E. Walker, who, as moderator of the meetings of the mission of which Rev. C. Eells was scribe, knew as much of the origin and purpose of Whitman's ride as anyone, wrote of Whitman to Rev. S. B. Treat, secretary of the American board, as follows: "His melancholy end seemed such as to bury all his errors and mistakes in the

grave with him." There they should and would have remained but for the invention of the saved Oregon fiction, with its perversions and falsifications of all the real and intensely interesting history of the acquisition of the old Oregon Territory, being Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and about 28,000 square miles of Montana and about 13,000 square miles of Wyoming, or nearly one-twelfth of our national domain on this continent. But for this falsification of the history of the acquisition of that vast region by the invention and dissemination of this fiction Marcus Whitman, who was not above a third or fourth rate man, would long since have lost all special interest for me, since the true story of his life shows the correctness of what Hon. Jesse Applegate (one of the real leaders of the 1843 migration) wrote me of him. "Whitman acted well his part, but it was not a high one. * * * He was not one to lead in a great enterprise. * * * He lacked the qualities needful in a leader of men."

Since writing these pages I have learned that in the Sacramento Union of November 16, 1864, over the signature of "C." (which means S. A. Clarke, then its Oregon correspondent) there appeared the following in an account of the proceedings on occasion of the presentation of the tomahawk, with which it was alleged Dr. Whitman was killed, to the archives of Oregon.

Hon. (J. H. ?) Moores, the speaker of the Oregon assembly, in the course of his remarks "Related an incident of our early history never to my knowledge before given to the public, and that was heard by him from the lips of the Rev. Mr. Spalding, another early missionary and the coadjutor of Dr. Whitman. When the Ashburton treaty was in progress, news came to the little settlement in Oregon that the Government was about disposing of the whole Northwest coast to the English, and it made a deep impression on the mind of Whitman, whose long residence had produced a sincere attachment for the land of his adoption. He appreciated its future value and importance, and looked upon its broad rivers and fertile valleys as fields for the development of population, wealth, and power. Time has realized the conjecture, which he did not live to see; but he was restless, under the impression that his favorite region might be transferred to another power, and, midwinter as it was, he undertook the dreary

and then dreaded journey across the plains for the sole purpose to remonstrate against the act. Webster was Secretary of State, and to him he went after hastening to Washington, and asked what was the character of the negotiations. He was told that the preliminaries of the treaty were about agreed upon, and his remonstrance was met with a smile.

[“Why, Doctor, you have come too late; we have about traded off the Northwest coast for a codfishery.”

“But, sir, you do not know what you are doing; you do not realize that that territory you mention with a smile, almost a sneer, could make a home for millions; that its broad navigable rivers lead to an ocean whose commerce includes the Indies and the empires of the Orient; that we have fine harbors and broad bays to invite that commerce thither and offer an anchorage to the navies of the world. Then there are beautiful and fertile valleys, whose harvests will yield eventually an increase to the nation’s wealth.”

“You are enthusiastic, Doctor,” answered the Secretary, with an easy smile. “You certainly are an enthusiast. The reports that come to us from Oregon differ materially from yours. The central portions of the continent are a barren waste, and the waters of the western slope course through a mountain wilderness or else a desert shore. The mountaineer can hunt and trap there. The tourist may sketch its snow-capped ridges, and describe the Indian in his native haunts. The trapper finds a home there.”

“Sir, you have no idea of the land you sneer at. Oregon has all the virtues we claim for it. A few Americans have gone thither to develop our nation’s wealth. We are far off, but our hearts are with the nation of our birth. We are pioneers, and can it be possible that our claims will be ignored, that our country can consent to trade off her territory and our allegiance to a foreign power?”]

“Dr. Whitman did not rest the question with the Secretary. He visited President Tyler himself, and left no stone unturned until he had awakened an interest in his cause in the minds of the President and a portion of his Cabinet, and a due consideration of the matter induced the final preservation of the greater portion of the Northwest Territory as a portion of the national domain.”

So much of this as I have put in brackets [], beginning with "Why, Doctor, you have come too late," and ending with "and our allegiance to a foreign power," I have known since 1885 was quoted on page 7 of Rev. M. Eells' pamphlet, "Marcus Whitman," etc., Portland, Oreg., 1883, prefaced by the statement (by Rev. M. Eells) that "They are taken from the Dansville (N. Y.) Advertiser of May 4, 1865, which copied them from the Sacramento Daily Bulletin."

But as I well knew there was never any such paper as the Sacramento Daily Bulletin—which fact Rev. M. Eells (who was born and has always lived in the old Oregon Territory) ought also to have known—I supposed this to be merely another of the numerous fabrications of alleged "authorities" which have been produced by the advocates of this myth, and so did not try to trace this quotation up until since finding the matter in the Sacramento Union, when the editor of the Dansville Advertiser, in reply to my letter of inquiry, wrote me that the article appeared in his paper on May 4, 1865, and that it was copied from the Sacramento Union.

Concerning this Sacramento Union article it is to be noted:

(1) That except the above-noted incomplete and improperly credited extract in the Dansville (N. Y.) Advertiser, it has never been quoted by the advocates of the "Whitman saved Oregon" tale in all their voluminous writings, which is why it has hitherto escaped my notice.

(2) That though explicitly declared to have been derived from Rev. H. H. Spalding, it is not signed by him, and so could easily have been disavowed by him and by his associates, if they had desired to do so, as not being an accurate report of what he had said.

(3) That in the same sentence in which it is asserted that the speaker of the Oregon assembly heard this tale from Mr. Spalding it is explicitly declared that it had never before been made public.

(4) That it gives no detailed statement that may be compared with contemporaneous documents as to (*a*) the real causes of Whitman's ride; (*b*) the date when he started; (*c*) the route he took; (*d*) the dates when he was at any places on the way, or when he reached the States, or when he was at Washington; (*e*) his connection with the migration of 1843.

(5) That brief and vague as it is, it contains several absolutely false statements, all of which, except the one marked (d) below, Spalding expanded and published a year later in the Pacific, as follows:

(a) That the sole purpose of Whitman's ride was to protest to the National Government against a proposition to trade off Oregon in the Ashburton treaty; (b) that the only cause of his going was a report that Oregon was likely to be traded off in that treaty; (c) that he arrived just in time to prevent the consummation of a trade of Oregon for a codfishery on the banks of Newfoundland; (d) that (although it gives no dates for his departure for the States or for his arrival at any point on his journey) it says that "it was midwinter" when he undertook the journey, whereas it was early in the autumn—October 3—when he started.

(6) That four men, namely, Rev. H. H. Spalding, Rev. C. Eells, Rev. E. Walker, and W. H. Gray, knew of their own knowledge exactly what caused Whitman's ride; and that of these, Rev. E. Walker, though living in Oregon till his death, on November 21, 1877, never, so far as yet appears, wrote so much as one sentence indorsing any form of the saving Oregon theory of that ride, and that whatever Spalding and Gray talked about it, neither of them ever ventured to write or print over his own signature, so that he could be held responsible for it, anything which claimed that Whitman's ride was for any other than missionary business, till Spalding's articles in the Pacific, October 19 and November 9, 1865, which articles contain such shameless slanders of the Hudson's Bay Company and the Catholic missionaries in Oregon, and such a great number of statements that (if he were sane) he must have known to be totally false, that one is shut up to the conclusion that either he was, as I am charitable enough to believe, an irresponsible person, or else a phenomenal and totally conscienceless prevaricator.

(7) That Rev. C. Eells never in any of his many unpublished letters in the files of the American board, or in anything else which has appeared in print, ever assigned anything but missionary business as a cause for Whitman's ride, or claimed that it had produced any political effect, till his letter of May 28, 1866 (published in the Missionary Herald in December, 1866), and that as late as April, 1865, he denied to Hon.

Elwood Evans, the historian of Oregon, any knowledge of anything but missionary business as impelling Whitman to make that ride.

Whitman's own letters of justification written after his return, in which he endeavored to defend himself from the censure of the secretary of the American board for his expensive disobedience to the order of the board of February, 1842, and in which he not only claimed all to which he was really entitled, but a vast deal more, are fully discussed in my "Fremont and Whitman book," and it only needs now to be said that in no one of them did he claim to have interviewed the President or the Secretary of State, or to have influenced in any way any negotiations about Oregon, or to have held any public meetings or addressed any such meetings held by others and designed to promote migration to Oregon, or to have printed anything in newspapers or in a pamphlet about Oregon, or that his ride was intended for any such purpose, but only that the two great objects of his ride were to save the mission from the destruction which he himself writes in these letters must have overtaken it if he had not made the ride, and to lead out a migration, or, to use his precise words, "It was to open a practical route and safe passage and a favorable report from immigrants."

An 8-page letter of Rev. H. H. Spalding to the secretary of the American board, dated as late as October, 1857 (from which nothing has yet been printed), though it has much to say of Dr. Whitman as a martyr and is bitterly denunciatory of the Catholics, and accuses them of inciting the Whitman massacre and severely arraigns the A. B. C. F. M. for not recognizing the value of Whitman's labors, and for refusing to "admit a line of this testimony" (i. e., "testimony" which Spalding had secured of persons who averred that the "Catholics were the promoting cause of that bloody tragedy" W. I. M.), "or any part of my communications in your publications" does not in all its eight foolscap pages—say 2,000 to 2,500 words—even intimate that Whitman had had anything to do with saving Oregon, or was entitled to any credit as a patriot, which is sufficient proof that as late as October, 1857, the "Whitman Saved Oregon" fiction had not begun to take shape even in Spalding's disordered mind.

